DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 078 PS 026 941

AUTHOR Mueller, Marsha R.

TITLE Immediately Outcomes of Lower-Income Participants in Minnesota's Universal Access Early Childhood Family Education. Early Childhood Family Education (ECFC) Evaluation Series; Changing Times, Changing Families-Phase II.

INSTITUTION Family Education Resources of Minnesota.; Minnesota State Dept. of Children, Families, and Learning, St. Paul.
SPONS AGENCY McKnight Foundation, Minneapolis, MN.
PUB DATE 1996-04-00
NOTE 181p.
AVAILABLE FROM Minnesota Children, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101-2273; phone: 612-296-6104; fax: 612-296-3272; e-mail: Children@state.mn.us; World Wide Web: http://children.state.mn.us
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Development; Child Rearing; Early Childhood Education; Knowledge Level; Low Income Groups; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Education; Parent Role; Parenting Skills; *Parents; Program Evaluation; Public Policy; Social Support Groups; *Young Children
IDENTIFIERS *Early Childhood Family Education; Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program is a voluntary public school family support and education program for parents of children from birth to kindergarten, and is offered in 360 school districts and the four tribal schools. An evaluation was conducted to learn what types of immediate outcomes could be expected for lower-income families participating in the program. During the 1994-95 school year, 700 families were surveyed from 14 school districts, with 150 families participating in additional in-depth interviews and videotaped observations. In addition, staff assessments and independent ratings were used to measure family outcomes. The major findings of the study indicate that: (1) ECFE makes a positive difference in parents' approach to parenting, parent-child relationships, and their child's behavior; (2) staff assessments of parents' knowledge, behavior, and role perception revealed improvement from fall to spring, with more parents improving in awareness of their child and child development than changes in parenting behavior; (3) there was a decline in number of parents receiving low ratings on measures of parent-child interaction from fall to spring; (4) lower-income families demonstrate different knowledge levels about child development and parenting skills, diverse demographic characteristics, different risk levels, and different amounts of social support; and (5) ECFE'S approach was effective with many different low-income families. The findings of the evaluation were used to make recommendations for public policy and program focus, and to identify issues for further evaluation. (Eight appendices include data collection and analysis strategies and data collection instruments. Contains 13 references.) (KB)

Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) Evaluation Series

Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase II

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 423 078

Immediate Outcomes of Lower-Income Participants in Minnesota's Universal Access Early Childhood Family Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Hanson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

PS 026941

Minnesota Children

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For more information or a copy of the full report contact:

Betty Cooke
Early Childhood and Family Initiatives Specialist

or

Lois Engstrom
Team Leader for Community and Family Education

Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning
992 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2273

Phone (612) 296-8414
FAX (612) 297-5695
E-mail: betty.cooke@state.mn.us

This evaluation was supported by a grant from The McKnight Foundation to Family Education Resources of Minnesota. In addition, the Minnesota state legislature earmarked $10,000 per fiscal year for ECFE evaluation.

Upon request, this report can be made available in alternative formats including Braille, audio tape, computer disk and large print.

Printed on Recycled Paper with a Minimum of 10% Post Consumer Waste

Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE)
Evaluation Series

Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase II

Immediate Outcomes of Lower-Income Participants in Minnesota's Universal Access Early Childhood Family Education

by

Marsha R. Mueller
Mueller Associates, LLC
Minneapolis, Minnesota

for
Family Education Resources of Minnesota and the
Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning

April 1996

Evaluation Team

Principal Evaluator: Marsha R. Mueller, President, Mueller Associates, LLC

Project Administration: Betty Cooke, Early Childhood and Family Initiatives Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning

Site Evaluators:

Urban
Judy Kynell, Duluth
*Robin McClelland, Duluth
Mary Dooley Burns, Minneapolis
Kate Horst, Minneapolis
Jolene Pearson, Minneapolis
Ron Gustafson, St. Paul
Phyllis Pleshek, St. Paul

Suburban
Jeanine Johnson, Anoka-Hennepin
Eileen Phifer, Anoka-Hennepin
*Carol Huttner, Bloomington-Richfield
Mike Welsh, Bloomington-Richfield
*Nancy Dilks, Chaska
Kerry Froehlich, Robbinsdale
Denise Mattes, Robbinsdale
Linda McMeen, Robbinsdale
*Sandy Coder, Shakopee

Rural
Linda Morical, Fergus Falls
*Joanne Kelley, Forest Lake
Mary Scott, Forest Lake
Lisa Kajer, Freshwater Education District
Judy Droubie, Freshwater Education District
Jean Anderson, Mankato
Linda Frost, Mankato
Ruth Supler, Moorhead
Kristine Aune, Winona
Karen Fawcett, Winona
Maureen Gaffron, Winona
Martha Larson, Winona

Reviewers for Project Planning and Strategy Development:

Lois Engstrom, Team Leader for Community and Family Education, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning
Michael Q. Patton, Union Institute
Byron Egeland, Irving B. Harris Professor of Child Development, University of Minnesota
Martha Erickson, Director, Children, Youth and Families Consortium, University of Minnesota
Ruth Thomas, Professor, University of Minnesota

Members of Family Education Resources of Minnesota Who Participated in Evaluation Planning and Review:

Mary Ann Cogelow
*Delores Fletcher
*Nancy Kristensen
Kathy Zanner
*Angele Passe
Jolene Pearson
*Sandy Coder
*Joanne Kelley
Barbara Gauger
*Beth Sandell
Anne Stokes
Yvonne Janning
Karen Kurz-Riemer
*Helen Wells
Betty Cooke
Lois Engstrom

Additional Program Site Coordinators Who Supported District Participation in the Project:

Ann Lovgren, Beverly Collova, Debra Eck, St. Paul
Marilee Christensen-Adams, Anoka-Hennepin
Beth Achter, Fergus Falls
Mary Jo Hofer, Freshwater Education District
Corrine Wesely, Mankato
Lauri Winterfeldt-Shanks, Moorhead

Independent Raters/Reviewers:
Jenifer Powell, University of Minnesota
Cathy Lawrence, University of Minnesota
Debbie Hunt, University of Minnesota

Data Processing:
Dave Eide, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning

Analysis Support and Technical Review:

Rosanna Armson, MCSR, University of Minnesota
Elisabeth Palmer, MCSR, University of Minnesota
Michael Q. Patton, Union Institute

Project Support:
Faye Lovell, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning

*ECFE Program Coordinator or Program Specialist at Evaluation Sites

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements 5

Introduction and Three Ways to Read This Report 7

Summary of Outcome Themes and Findings 8

Part I: Background 15

Program Overview 15

Shared Concerns 18

ECFE Approach to Evaluation 20

Part II: Evaluation Overview and Findings 23

Evaluation Overview 23

Purpose 23

Primary Intended Users 23

Evaluation Approach 24

Analysis Approach 29

What We Learned About Families--Evaluation Findings 31

To What Extent Are Lower-Income Families Enrolling in ECFE? 31

What Are the Characteristics of Lower-Income Families Enrolling in ECFE? 32

What Knowledge and Skills Do Parents Bring to ECFE? 40

To What Extent Do Lower-Income Families Participate in ECFE And HowDo They Assess Their Experience? 56

What We Learned About Immediate Outcomes--Evaluation Findings 59

How Do Parents, Staff and Independent Raters Assess Parent Outcomes? 59

Parents' Assessments of Their Change 59

Staff Assessment of Parent Change 64

Independent Raters' Assessment of Parent Behavior Change 75

What Did We Learn About Parents Whose Scores Changed? 79

Part III: Recommendations--Program Response to Evaluation Findings **83**

Recommendations for Policy 83

Recommendations for Programs 84

New Evaluation Issues 85

Part IV: Reflections on Evaluation Process and Approach **87**

Staff Reflections: Advantages and Disadvantages of Staff Involvement and Recommendations for Future Evaluations 87

Author's Comments: Specific Evaluation Strategies, Statistical Significance of Change Findings 91

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Response Patterns, New-to-ECFE Families, Fall 1994 and Spring 1995 Enrollment Surveys 93

Appendix 2: Demographic Attributes, New-to-ECFE Families 94

Appendix 3: Chi Square Results--Study Families Compared to Other Lower-Income Respondents to the 1994 ECFE Fall Enrollment Survey 99

Appendix 4-- Data Collection Strategies:

4.1: Fall Enrollment Survey 102

4.2: Spring Enrollment Survey 107

4.3: Fall/Spring Parent Interview Guide 112

4.4: Stimulated Response Interview Guide 115

4.5: Participation Record 117

Appendix 5--Analysis Strategies:

5.1: Parent Interview Analysis Summary 118

5.2: Stimulated Response Interview Analysis Summary 126

5.3: Parent Interview Critical Codes 130

5.4: SRI Critical Codes 135

5.5: Fall Interviews--Score Sheet 137

5.6: Spring Interviews--Score Sheet 139

5.7: Development of the Parent Behavior Rating Scale, by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood and Family Initiatives Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning 143

5.8: Parent Behavior Rating Scale 145

Appendix 6: Analysis Notes-- Factor Analysis, Regression Analysis, and Reliability of Staff and Independent Ratings, by Elizabeth Palmer, Minnesota Center for Survey Research, University of Minnesota 153

Appendix 7: Characteristics of Study Families That Dropped Out of the Evaluation 157

Appendix 8: Availability of Evaluation Materials 160

References 161

About the Author 162

Acknowledgments

Over the past two and a half years, 60 people contributed to this evaluation. They made a project of this complexity and duration possible because they shared the technical skill, subject matter and program insight to address the evaluation questions. Without exception, everyone served with unflagging interest and commitment. It was an honor for me to work with and get to know this special group of dedicated individuals.

Three years ago Betty Cooke developed a proposal to study parent outcomes. A grant from The McKnight Foundation to Family Education Resources of Minnesota (FERM) supported this project. Betty served as project administrator, facilitated communication, revised the rating scale used by independent raters, and was a constant source of inspiration and motivation to me as well as the entire team. Lois Engstrom and members of FERM worked to shape this evaluation, clarify guiding principles for the study process, review drafts of data collection strategies and report findings. In addition, Lois and members of FERM participated with site evaluators in evaluation workshops.

Twenty-eight ECFE staff from 14 school districts served as site evaluators. The roles each performed are important to note in some detail because they show what's possible when program staff are partners in evaluations. Site evaluators joined the team in January 1994. They helped shape evaluation plans, revised preliminary drafts of data collection strategies, piloted these strategies and suggested additional revisions based on their experience, participated in four workshops, implemented surveys of all families new to ECFE, selected interview and observation participants, conducted in-depth personal interviews and videotaped observations, prepared transcripts, coded interview data, reviewed report drafts, and helped shape recommendations. Their interest and commitment never failed. The technical quality of their work was very high. Their ability to establish meaningful relationships with families had a direct bearing on the high completion rate achieved with study families. In addition, most site evaluators volunteered to monitor the progress of study families for a second year. Their commitment to learning about the families they serve is exemplary.

The school districts that participated in this evaluation also deserve recognition. The time and effort devoted by site evaluators and, in many cases, program coordinators far exceeded the honorarium districts or evaluators received. In addition, this evaluation could not have been done without the participation of more than 700 families from the 14 school districts. All families willingly responded to questionnaires, and 150 of those families took the time to reflect about their own parenting behavior and allowed us into their homes and family lives to observe how they interact with their children.

Four external reviewers provided special expertise during different phases of the evaluation process. Byron Egeland, Martha Erickson, Michael Q. Patton, and Ruth Thomas reviewed evaluation plans and raised important questions. In addition, Byron Egeland identified graduate students from the University of Minnesota's Institute of Child Development who served as raters. Jennifer Powell and Cathy Lawrence rated 236 videotapes of parents interacting with their children. Debbie Hunt reviewed staff coding for all 536 interview transcripts.

Michael Patton's influence on this study was especially helpful. Over the past 20 years ECFE has worked with him on many evaluations. Most recently, Michael served as the evaluation consultant on Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase I. ECFE's interest and commitment to evaluation going into this project reflected his involvement and special gifts. Michael provided invaluable review and advice both to me and the evaluation team during important phases of the study.

Data processing requirements for this study were substantial. Dave Eide from the Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning managed data entry for surveys, interview summaries, participation records, and independent raters' score sheets. Rosanna Armson and Elisabeth Palmer from the Minnesota Center for Survey Research assisted with data analysis. Lis Palmer's responsiveness and superior quantitative skills were invaluable. Faye Lovell from the Department of Children, Families and Learning provided clerical and communication support for this project.

Finally, The McKnight Foundation and Nancy Latimer, Senior Program Officer, provided valuable support. The mission of The McKnight Foundation is to enhance the capacity for productive living for people who are poor or disadvantaged.

This project combined two aims. The first represented a conventional use of program evaluation--to understand immediate program outcomes, make recommendations and share information about the evaluation results with others. The second was to support ECFE effectiveness by involving staff in the entire evaluation process. It is assumed that ECFE participants (Minnesota families) benefit from staff involvement. Program staff who have skills in thinking critically about information are in a better position to make optimal practice decisions.

Marsha R. Mueller
Minneapolis, Minnesota
April, 1996

Introduction and Three Ways To Read This Report

This evaluation emerged from issues ECFE programs share with families, policy makers, educators, community leaders and colleagues in family support and early education programs around the country: *concerns about families and children; questions about the effectiveness of universal access programs* in supporting families, particularly families most in need; and *limited information about family outcomes.*

The purpose of this evaluation was to learn what kinds of immediate outcomes we can expect for lower-income families participating in Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education programs. During the 1994-1995 school year, over 700 families were surveyed from 14 school districts, and 150 of these families participated in two rounds of in-depth interviews and videotaped observations. The focus of this report is on what families bring to programs and what we learned about immediate outcomes.

This report can be read in several ways:

(1) For those who want the bottom-line summary of outcome themes and findings, the summary, pages 8 through 14 covers essential information.

(2) Those who want primary findings *and* background information about ECFE programs and issues will find all of Part I useful.

(3) Those who want the full discussion of this evaluation, including study design and empirical findings as well as ECFE's response, will find Parts II and III useful. In addition, Part IV summarizes reflections of staff and the author about the evaluation process and may be of particular interest (along with pages 20 through 22) to those grappling with how to evaluate family programs.

"Comments" are marked in the report of empirical findings. These comments serve as a discussion of findings and introduce additional information to consider.

OUTCOME THEMES

What did we learn about lower-income family outcomes?

From parents:

1. Data from parents show that ECFE made a positive difference in their approach to parenting, parent-child relationships and their child's behavior. Following six to ten months of participation, 92 percent of low-income parents reported their participation in ECFE made a positive difference in their awareness and understanding of children and child development, in their confidence as a parent, and feelings of social support. Seventy-two percent reported improvements in how they relate to their child. Changes in children's behavior reported by parents included increased independence, improved language and communication skills, improved relationships with other children, and more self-confidence.

From staff:

2. Systematic staff assessments of parents' knowledge, behavior, and role perception revealed improvements from fall to spring. In general, more lower-income parents demonstrated improved awareness of their child and child development than changes in parenting behavior and parent role perception.

The recommendations underscore the need for staff to recognize the tenuous relationship between knowledge and behavior change and review how programs help parents actively observe, practice and reflect on their parenting behavior and parent-child relationships. Knowledge change does not guarantee behavior change.

From independent raters:

3. Independent ratings by child development specialists at the University of Minnesota showed a decrease in number of parents receiving low ratings on measures of parent-child interaction from fall to spring. The number of parents receiving low ratings on the Parent Behavior Rating Scale decreased 27 percent.

What did we learn about lower-income families?

What lower-income families bring to ECFE:

4. Lower-income families who come to ECFE demonstrate different levels of knowledge about child development and parenting skills, diverse demographic characteristics, different levels of accumulated risk, and different amounts of social support. Parents have in common satisfaction with family life, commitment to spending time with their families, and concerns about children and money. Lower-income families represented 36 percent of all ECFE participants in 1994 and 58 percent of new enrollees at study sites.

Characteristics of lower-income parents who demonstrated change:

5. ECFE's universal access approach is effective with <u>many different</u> low-income families. Families with different characteristics demonstrate positive knowledge and behavior change. In this study neither demographics, hours of participation nor number of risk factors predicted whether a parent's knowledge or behavior scores improved.

Specific findings related to these five themes are listed here.

FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOME THEMES

➢ *What did we learn about lower-income family outcomes?*

Parents' Assessment of Their Change:

THEME 1

Data from parents show that ECFE made a positive difference in their approach to parenting, parent-child relationships and their child's behavior. Following six to ten months of participation, 92 percent of low-income parents reported their participation in ECFE made a positive difference in their awareness and understanding of children and child development, in their confidence as a parent, and social support. Seventy-two percent reported improvements in how they relate to their child. Changes in children's behavior reported by parents included increased independence, improved language and communication skills, improved relationships with other children, and more self-confidence.

- Over 92 percent of low-income parents reported that participation in ECFE gave them more confidence as a parent, more social support, and better knowledge and understanding of child development. In addition, 72 percent reported better relationships with their children.

- Study parents reported that ECFE helped improve their strategies for child guidance and the way they manage their own frustrations. Study parents (70 percent) reported using better guidance strategies with their children, and 65 percent reported handling their own frustrations better.

Staff Assessment of Parent Change:

THEME 2

Systematic staff assessments of parents' knowledge, behavior, and role perception revealed improvements from fall to spring. In general, more study parents demonstrated improved awareness of their child and child development than changes in parenting behavior and parent role perception.

- As a group, parents' interview scores improved in all concept areas. Most importantly, the percentage of parents receiving low scores declined. In the area of knowledge and awareness

of one's own child, the percentage of parents receiving low scores declined 57 percent; in parent role perception, 29 percent; and in the parent behavior, 27 percent.

- An analysis of individual scores reveals that 25-34 percent of parents demonstrated positive score change in all concept areas. More parents demonstrated positive change in knowledge and awareness of their children (34 percent) than parent behavior (25 percent) or parent role perception (25 percent).

Independent Raters' Assessment of Parent Behavior Change:

THEME 3
Independent ratings by child development specialists at the University of Minnesota showed a decrease in number of parents receiving low ratings on measures of parent-child interaction from fall to spring. The number of parents receiving low ratings on the Parent Behavior Rating Scale decreased 27 percent.

- Independent ratings of parents' behavior, as demonstrated in videotaped interaction with their children, showed a 27 percent decline in the number of parents with low ratings. For the total sample, 8 percent of parents showed improvement.

➢ *What do lower-income families bring to ECFE?*

THEME 4
Lower-income families who come to ECFE demonstrate different levels of knowledge about child development and parenting skills, diverse demographic characteristics, different levels of accumulated risk, and different amounts of social support. Parents have in common satisfaction with family life, commitment to spending time with their families, and concerns about children and money. Lower-income families represented 36 percent of all ECFE participants in 1994 and 58 percent of new enrollees at study sites.

Findings About Lower-Income Parents' Characteristics:

- Lower-income families represented 58 percent of all new ECFE participants at study sites.

- Almost all study parents were females (98 percent) and reported incomes less than $20,000 per year (72 percent). Many study parents had completed education beyond high school (65 percent), were between 20 and 29 years old (63 percent) and were unmarried (54 percent). Most parents (69 percent) had children between 13 months and 2 years of age, and 64 percent reported three to four people living in their household. Over half of the study families (53 percent) had lived at their current address less than a year.

- Most parents were concerned about money (68 percent) and their children (53 percent). Within the past year 54 percent of the parents had moved and over 40 percent had experienced a significant decrease in income or serious money problems.

- Most parents (83 percent) were satisfied with family life, 80 percent reported spending time with their families on a regular basis, and 49 percent shared parenting duties with someone else. Sixty percent of parents were dissatisfied with the amount of time they could call their own.

- Most parents (80 percent) reported having social contacts outside the home, although for many (40 percent) contacts are limited. Parents were satisfied with their contacts and give help to others as often as they receive help. Most parents, however (60 percent), would like to spend more time with other parents.

Findings About What Lower-Income Parents Bring to ECFE:

- Parents come to ECFE displaying both strengths and weaknesses. Staff rated what parents said in four concept areas: knowledge and understanding of their child and child development; parenting behavior; parent role perception; and parent self-assessment. Staff assessed most parents as displaying moderate knowledge or skill in two concept areas: parent self-assessment (71 percent rated moderate) and knowledge/awareness of own child (52 percent rated moderate). Most parents received low ratings for parent behavior (69 percent) and parent role perception (61 percent).

- Independent raters assessed parenting behavior on the basis of videotaped observations. Lower-income parents coming to ECFE exhibited different levels of parenting behavior. Most parents (65 percent) were rated three or four on a five point scale. Slightly over a third received lower ratings of two or one.

- Very few parents, less than 5 percent, displayed hostility toward their child.

Findings About Family Exposure to ECFE and Parents' Assessment of Their ECFE Experience:

- Study families participated in ECFE an average of 42 hours, with a range from 8 to 126 hours. All study families (100 percent) participated in parent-child classes, and 44 percent reported participating in two to four other kinds of ECFE activities or services such as home visits, special classes, or events.

- Over 81 percent of all low-income parents responding to the spring survey reported ECFE was worthwhile, and 85 percent regarded staff as respectful and responsive.

➢ ***What did we learn about lower-income parents who demonstrated change?***

> **THEME 5**
> **ECFE's universal access approach is effective with many different low-income families.** Families with different characteristics demonstrate positive knowledge and behavior change and families who come with moderate or high skills maintain those skills. In this study neither demographics, hours of participation, nor number of risk factors predicted parent's whose knowledge or behavior scores improved.

- Results of the regression analysis showed that neither demographic attributes, number of risk factors, nor hours of participation predicts changes in parents' scores. In other words, characteristics of parents we know something about account for very little of the variance in parent score change for either staff or independent ratings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ECFE's Response to Evaluation Findings

Program staff reviewed evaluation findings and responded with the following recommendations.

Recommendations for Policy:

1. Continue Minnesota's commitment to universal access ECFE programs. There is no compelling evidence to support specific targeting of ECFE programs on families with specific characteristics. This evaluation found that families with different characteristics exhibiting low levels of knowledge or parenting behavior demonstrate positive change. In addition, families who come with moderate or high skills maintain those skills. ECFE's universal access approach builds on voluntary choice, individualized programs and services, and the collaborative nature of adult learning by connecting families with other families in their community.

2. Expand funding for ECFE so that more than 40 percent of the eligible population can be served. Currently, ECFE reaches 40 percent of the eligible population of families with children from birth through four years of age in Minnesota. Programs are doing all they can do with current resources including extensive collaboration with others providing services to families with young children in their communities. To reach more eligible families, particularly those

that are low-income, additional resources are needed. Many families do not participate because they are experiencing complex and stressful family situations. Resources for more comprehensive services are of particular importance.

3. Universal access programs with guided parent-child interaction components are needed through elementary school to support the evolution of positive parent-child relationships. Continuing positive effects of early ECFE exposure are not guaranteed. Programs are needed to support positive parent-child relationships as children and parents evolve over time and respond to life's challenges and opportunities. Emerging research is showing that programs focusing on children's cognitive growth *and* parenting prevent later delinquency and antisocial behavior.

Recommendations for Programs:

1. Work on building meaningful relationships based on understanding and trust with every parent. The time, interest and attention focused on study families improved their involvement in ECFE as well as staff knowledge of families. In-depth staff understanding of families *and* parent participation supports children and parent change. Relationship building--between parents and children *and* staff and families--is the central premise of ECFE. *Reacting with interest*, as soon as possible, to each and every family is vital.

2. Recognize that change in knowledge does not guarantee change in behavior--review all educational methods and look for ways to help parents observe, practice, and reflect on parenting behavior and their parent-child relationships.

- Recognize that parents (as adults) learn in different ways and over different lengths of time--some learn quickly, some take more time. Explore ways to meet individualized adult learning styles.
- Consider how teaching strategies effect behavioral change as well as knowledge change.
- Explore how to use videotaping more effectively as a teaching tool for developing parent observation, reflection and questioning skills; parent self-awareness; and parent ability to set goals for themselves and their children.
- Explore uses of evaluation strategies for ongoing staff development and program evaluation *and* teaching.
- Review how staff think about, plan for and implement the parent-child interaction component.
- Include more practice of skills taught in parent education and parent-child interaction activities. Integrate content/knowledge, support, and skill building, not neglecting any component.

3. Recognize that informed judgments must be made about parents' knowledge and skills to implement effective programs. Effective programs--programs which make a significant difference in the relationships between parents and children--evolve from informed judgments

about what families bring to programs and what should be done to encourage positive change. *Making informed judgments about families is different from and should not be confused with judgmental assumptions* about family characteristics, behaviors or attitudes. Informed judgments are driven by a commitment to achieve best practice decisions and require thorough understanding of families, child development and family research, and cultural sensitivity. Families who come to ECFE are diverse and lock-step approaches to programming are not effective. Informed judgments provide the rationale for flexible, adaptive programs which have the capacity of serving well many different families.

Programs should encourage staff discussion of the role judgments play in programming, make distinctions between informed judgments and judgmental assumptions, and understand how judgments are translated into effective work with families.

4. Continue building ongoing evaluation into all program efforts and providing staff evaluation experience. The results of both phase I and II of the Changing Times, Changing Families studies of ECFE show strong growth in evaluation skills and use of information by program staff involved. Similar types of involvement for other staff members can enhance the positive effects of using evaluation processes and data in program delivery.

New Evaluation Issues:

1. Learn more about short-term outcomes of low-income families of color participating in ECFE. Although specific efforts were made to involve families of color in the study, only 17.5 percent of the study families were families of color. This raises issues that need to be addressed about the involvement and retention of families of color in ECFE. As this issue is addressed, short-term outcomes for ethnically diverse low-income program participants can also be better assessed.

2. Study outcomes demonstrated by families participating more than one program year. Since the families involved in the study participated for only six to nine months, we need to learn about what kinds of outcomes are demonstrated when families remain involved in ECFE. Questions such as the following need to be addressed: Does more knowledge and behavior change occur after longer periods of participation? Does continued involvement in ECFE help parents who demonstrate little change after six to ten months? How much involvement in ECFE is enough to support effective parenting? How effective is ECFE in supporting positive parent-child relationships as both parents and children develop and confront new life experiences?

3. Identify program practices and management strategies that support positive family change. As more is learned about changes families make in ECFE, districts and program sites can be identified that consistently support positive parent-child outcomes. These districts and programs can be studied to learn more about effective practices and management strategies.

Part I: Background

This section provides a general overview of Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education programs and the development of this evaluation.

Program Overview

Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) is a voluntary public school program for all Minnesota families with children between the ages of birth and kindergarten. It is offered through Community Education in 360 school districts and the four tribal schools. All families with young children in the state have access to ECFE. During the 1994-95 school year, more than 260,000 young children and their parents participated.

Minnesota's ECFE program is the largest and oldest statewide family support and education program for young children and their families in the country. ECFE is unique because it combines in a common delivery model the following attributes: (1) universal access; (2) child-focused, family-focused, and parent-child interaction components; and, (3) individualized approaches. ECFE was developed through a series of pilot programs funded by the Minnesota Legislature from 1974 to 1983. In 1984, the legislature made it possible for any district with a community education program to establish an ECFE program. ECFE is funded by over $32 million in state aid and local levies.

Mission and Significance. The mission of ECFE is to strengthen families through the education and support of all parents in providing the best possible environment for the healthy growth and development of their children. ECFE practice emphasizes the importance of families and community working together to support the healthy development of children. Families provide children their first and most important learning environment, and parents are children's first and most significant teachers. Over time parents share responsibility for their children's social, cognitive and emotional development with teachers, schools and other members of the community. The first few years of life are vitally important and critically shaped by parents and other primary care givers. The quality of relationships and early experiences in a young child's life set the stage for healthy development, school readiness, academic accomplishment and responsible adulthood.

ECFE's message is that what parents do is important. ECFE recognizes and supports parental understanding of children as well as the development of their parental roles. The way parents guide and nurture their own children, the quality of the parent-child relationship, and their skill in working with others who share responsibility for their

children's development (teachers, schools and others in the community) is critical to their children's future and the quality and capacity of our country's human capital.

ECFE Approach. ECFE is unique because it combines multiple attributes which are usually found in separate programs in a common delivery model: universal access; child-focused, family-focused, and parent-child interaction components; and individualized approaches. In all communities families come to ECFE with different skills, unique issues and experiences. ECFE programs provide different types and intensities of services to meet specific family situations, and families select those most appropriate for them. Most programs include parent discussion groups, guided play and learning time for children, parent-child interaction time focusing on parent-child relationships, home visits, early screening for children's health and developmental problems, information on other community resources for families and young children, special events, and libraries of books, toys and other learning materials.

Typically, a family attends a two-hour session each week that includes parent-child interaction time and additional learning opportunities for infants, toddlers and preschoolers while parents participate in a discussion group. Families needing more or different services may receive home visits or other specialized services. Programs also offer sessions for families with specific concerns, such as single parents, teen parents, parents of children with disabilities, employed parents and others. Activities are provided at a variety of times during the day, evenings and weekends by professional parent educators and early childhood teachers. Program sites include schools, shopping centers, apartment buildings, homeless shelters, churches and other community facilities.

Parents work with district ECFE staff to shape and guide the program. All districts solicit parent ideas and adapt programs for specific interests. For example, the focus of parent discussion groups is shaped by parent requests. Parents are surveyed to clarify their interests and needs and to understand how they assess ECFE activities. Formal strategies are also used to involve parents. All districts have established parent-run advisory councils at ECFE program sites, and parents participate in district program reviews to assess the quality of local programs.

Early Childhood Family Education works hard to serve a representative cross-section of families with young children. Many districts have developed extensive collaborations with other community human service, health and education programs to meet growing enrollment demands and diverse issues brought by families. ECFE is an active partner in Minnesota's family service collaboratives and in many community-based family support efforts. ECFE also works closely with Minnesota Learning Readiness and early elementary programs to support parent and teacher understanding of child

development and family issues. More recently, ECFE is being called on in several districts to help shape and support parent involvement initiatives in elementary schools.

Program Classification. Distinctions are made among early childhood programs based on service delivery and purpose. These distinctions are helpful for policy makers, funders, and communities to evaluate different approaches to serving families with young children. The Winter 1995 issue of The Future of Children (pp. 8-9) describes three major categories as follows:

> ***Child-focused programs*** include (1) preschool, Head Start, and pre-kindergarten, and (2) child care programs. *Preschool, Head Start*, and *pre-kindergarten programs* are typically part-day and part-year programs that bring groups of four-year-olds (or three- to five-year-olds) together in centers or school settings. Some offer primarily an educational program; others also provide health and developmental screenings, parent involvement, and social service assistance. Most preschool programs have been designed to promote child development and improve children's readiness to succeed in school. Publicly funded preschool programs typically serve children from disadvantaged families, while private preschool programs supported by parent fees serve children from all backgrounds.
>
> In contrast, child care programs typically offer care on a full-day basis to children from birth to school age. Such care can be provided either in a center or in a caregiver's home. Most child care programs seek both to promote child development and to free parents from their child care responsibilities so they can work. Recent reports have raised concerns about the quality of typical child care programs. Child care services are purchased by parents from a wide array of nonprofit and for-profit providers. Public funds support subsidies that help some low-income parents pay for care while they work or attend school.
>
> Preschool and child care programs are sometimes grouped together and called early childhood care and education, emphasizing their overlapping goals and activities. However, different histories, perceived missions, sources and levels of public investment, and research traditions conspire to perpetuate their separateness and to suggest that they are unlikely to produce equivalent effects on children and families.
>
> ***Family-focused programs*** can also be broken into two categories. *Family support programs* typically serve families with children under three years of age (though many include older children) through weekly or monthly home visits, or through classes or drop-in centers for parents. These programs strive to involve parents in their children's development and to strengthen their parenting skills, with the hope that changes in the parents will help to create, sustain, and amplify positive outcomes for the children.
>
> ***Two-generation programs***, the newest type of early childhood program, link programs for children and parenting support with adult-oriented services such as job training or adult education for the parents. Primarily targeting low-income families, these programs often use a case manager to broker services that are actually provided to families by other community agencies. Two-generation programs seek to promote positive outcomes for both children and

parents (hence, "two-generation"); they try to help families escape poverty while simultaneously promoting child development and helping parents learn new parenting skills.

Both family support and two-generation programs typically rely on funds from public agencies or private foundations to support services which are then usually offered free of charge to families. Although some family-focused programs are open to all families, most concentrate their efforts on families facing such challenges as poverty, teen parenthood, immigrant status, or welfare dependency.

ECFE does not fit into any <u>one</u> category described above. As mentioned before, ECFE is unique because it combines in one common model child-focused (preschool), family-focused and parent-child interaction components, and universal access. ECFE's family-focus emphasizes parent education and does not include, in most districts, parent vocational training. The child-focused component provides a once a week preschool experience for young children.

ECFE, in most districts, is part of a continuum of programs offered to all families with young children in Minnesota. ECFE is formally tied to Minnesota's Learning Readiness programs. Learning Readiness is a public, statewide primarily child-focused initiative designed to enhance school readiness for all three and one-half and four-year-olds. In addition, ECFE programs are a component of most Family Literacy programs. Family Literacy programs are two-generation programs which include Adult Basic Education and vocational programs for low-income families in Minnesota.

The comprehensive nature of Minnesota's approach is identified in a recent report from the National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University. Minnesota is identified as one of six states nationally with *". . .comprehensive interconnected initiatives, guided by clear goals targeted to young children and families, with program and planning components."* (Columbia University, 1995, p.1)

Shared Concerns

This evaluation was shaped by and designed for ECFE staff and incorporates their recognition of broader concerns: concerns shared with policy makers, the American public, community leaders and colleagues in family support and early education programs around the country. The following interrelated concerns set the stage for three months of evaluation planning during the fall of 1993.

Concerns About All Families and Children and How to Serve Those Most in Need. The first sentence in a recent book by child and family policy experts Kamerman and Kahn notes that "America's children are in trouble, and Americans know it" (1995). Barely a day goes by without disparaging reports in the media about children, families, and educational achievement: the number of children growing up in poverty, rates of infant deaths, juvenile crime, adolescent pregnancy, child abuse, drug use, failing educational achievement, the number of single parent and dual career households as well as divorced and never-married parents.

The capacity of parents to parent, the quality of the relationship parents have with their children, and the ability of parents and educators over time to work as partners in producing educated and successful young people is an important national issue. There is growing recognition that what happens to children and families is important to our country's future; but little consensus about what should be done, for whom and at what price.

Indicators of family issues are felt by ECFE programs. During the 1994-1995 school year, over 8,000 families were referred to ECFE by human service agencies, medical personnel, and the judicial system. Over 6,000 children with disabilities and developmental delays were served. In the fall of 1994, 36 percent of all families in ECFE had incomes under $30,000 and over 20 percent had incomes less than $20,000. In Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth, 59 percent had incomes under $30,000.

Questions About the Effectiveness of Universal Access Programs in Serving Low-Income Families. More information is needed about the effectiveness of universal access programs in working with lower-income families and families most in need. Only a few states have universal access family education and support programs. A recent Family Resource Coalition document describes six statewide initiatives providing non-targeted family education and support (Goetz, 1992). Most programs serving young families, of which there are estimated to be thousands, are limited in scope and/or focus; programs tend to be targeted at specific groups of families with specific needs or focus exclusively on children. Limited funds for evaluation have prevented extensive evaluation of programs, and questions persist about the effectiveness of universal approaches (Weiss, 1990). A common perception is that universal access programs, including ECFE, attract and serve middle-income families. Questions remain about the effectiveness of universal access approaches in serving lower-income families.

A Need for More Information About Family Outcomes. ECFE's work with families is grounded in child development and family research. The challenge for all ECFE programs is to serve as effective translators and consultants. Family educators must understand and accommodate changing demands on family life and specific family issues

to effectively help families learn about and apply accepted child development and parenting knowledge in ways that are meaningful. This requires that families and ECFE professionals work hard to understand each other.

ECFE is particularly committed to helping parents understand their children and interact well with them. Programs that purport to help families in these ways must assess whether or not, and in what ways, families actually are helped.

ECFE Approach to Evaluation

A discussion of ECFE's approach to evaluation is included here for two reasons. First, evaluation has played a significant role in ECFE since it began as a pilot program in 1974. Evaluation has had an impact on program evolution and, in turn, ECFE's philosophy and approach shapes evaluation that is conducted. Second, many family support initiatives in Minnesota and other states are trying to find effective ways to evaluate their programs. This description is provided as an example of one way to approach the task.

Since the first six pilot ECFE programs were established in 1975, evaluation has been a priority. In the early years evaluation was essential to document local acceptance of the program, to help shape program development, and to inform policy makers of ECFE progress. Over the years evaluation has become integrated into ECFE practice and is viewed by most staff as a strategic learning opportunity; both the process and products of evaluations are used to understand families and shape program effectiveness. Today, many ECFE professionals are sophisticated evaluation users.

ECFE's history of evaluation is documented in several reports (Harvard Family Research Project, 1990, Minnesota Department of Education, 1986, and Seppanen and Hirfetz, 1988). These reports note that evaluations of ECFE have focused, for the most part, on program processes. As with other early childhood and family support programs, funds have not been available for evaluation of outcomes. However, ECFE has developed--despite funding constraints--an effective approach to meeting information needs. Key attributes of this approach are described here.

•Formalized evaluation planning structure. A statewide evaluation committee was established in 1986 to make recommendations and guide efforts related to program evaluation. In 1989, the committee formed the private, nonprofit organization Family Education Resources of Minnesota (FERM). The purpose of FERM is to conduct evaluation, training, technical assistance, research, and dissemination activities and to

develop and monitor programming related to ECFE and other family support and early childhood initiatives. FERM members include local staff, district coordinators and state department specialists. Parents, university experts, and consultants are called in from time to time to serve as advisors. This planning structure allows for spread of evaluation decision-making within ECFE and the flexibility to develop proposals and solicit funds for training and evaluation activities.

•Framework for setting the evaluation agenda and establishing priorities. FERM adapted the "Five-Tiered Approach to Evaluation" developed by Francine Jacobs and described in *Evaluating Family Programs* (1988) to use in determining priorities. FERM recognizes ongoing needs for information for different purposes and users; ranging from very basic accountability needs to information about participant outcomes. The framework helps FERM assess gaps in evaluation information and focus evaluation resources in any given planning period.

•Evaluation purpose and guiding principles. The purpose of all ECFE evaluations is to enhance understanding of families and improve program effectiveness--*to learn and improve*. In 1989, in preparation for the Phase I outcome evaluation, FERM worked with Michael Patton to articulate a philosophy of evaluation in active terms. The result was a list of guiding principles to be followed in the design and conduct of the first phase of this outcome evaluation. The principles were developed through discussion with FERM members, ECFE staff and evaluation consultants and formally approved by FERM. The principles are recorded in descriptions of evaluation projects, are used by FERM to assess the work, and are reviewed and revised as new evaluations are initiated. Table 1 lists the principles developed for both Phase I and Phase II outcome evaluations.

These evaluation principles are significant. The principles underscore ECFE's expectations that evaluations are collaborative ventures and should be an integrated component of programs. The principles emphasize staff involvement in evaluation and use of information to enhance program effectiveness. The principles set clear parameters for making evaluation design decisions and allow staff to work as partners with evaluation consultants in all phases of an evaluation.

Table 1: Guiding Principles Established by FERM for ECFE Outcome Evaluations

Phase I Evaluation	*Phase II Evaluation*
•Conduct a non-intrusive study;	•Conduct a study that is sensitive to participants and programs--study strategies should not disrupt participants or programs;
•Conduct a study which supports diversity in the program and participants;	•Conduct a study which supports diversity;
•Conduct a study which involves a reasonable amount of effort on the part of everyone involved, and;	•Conduct a study in which study team members are reasonably compensated, trained, and supported;
•Conduct a study that is helpful, useful, and oriented toward program improvement.	•Conduct a study which is helpful, useful, oriented toward program improvement;
	•Conduct a study which makes use of data collection strategies which can be implemented by staff and yield information which staff can analyze and use with limited outside support;
	•Conduct a study which allows for sharing of evaluation information during the study.

Efforts to Assess Outcomes. In 1989 the Minnesota legislature appropriated $25,000 for Early Childhood Family Education evaluation which led to the first ECFE outcome study, Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase I. These funds were used for a statewide study of parent change after a year of program participation. Staff from 24 ECFE programs worked with Michael Patton, evaluation consultant, to design and conduct the Phase I study. Parent knowledge about children and how they develop, expectations about their children and themselves as parents, and behaviors and interactions with their children were shown to change after participation in ECFE. Parents also reported gaining a strong sense of support from others and observing increased social skills in their children after program participation. The Phase I evaluation included a purposeful sample of 183 parents, most of whom were middle-income, married mothers. Findings were based on two rounds of parent interviews.

Following the Phase I study, FERM developed a proposal to study the impact of ECFE on lower-income families. In 1993, The McKnight Foundation awarded a $150,000 grant to FERM for this evaluation, and the Minnesota Legislature earmarked $10,000 per fiscal year for ECFE evaluation. Planning for Phase II began in September 1993. The remainder of this report describes the approach and results of the Phase II evaluation.

Part II--Evaluation Overview and Findings

Evaluation Overview

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation was to understand what kinds of immediate outcomes we can expect for lower-income families participating in Minnesota's Early Childhood Family Education programs. This evaluation focused on the following questions:

Interest	To what extent are lower-income families entering ECFE and what are their characteristics?
Parent Skills and Abilities	What child development knowledge and parenting skills do lower-income parents bring to ECFE?
Exposure	To what extent are families involved in ECFE and how do they assess their experience?
Immediate Outcomes	How do parents, staff and independent raters assess changes in parent skills and abilities?
Who Benefits	What do we know about parents who demonstrate change?

Primary Intended Users

The primary intended users of this evaluation are ECFE programs. The information will be used to enhance staff understanding of the families they serve and to assist them in making changes in their work.

Evaluation Approach

Unit of Analysis

This evaluation focused on families new to ECFE with a child between the ages of birth and 3 years and reported pre-tax income under $29,999.

Study Sites

Fourteen school districts participated in the evaluation. They were selected by geographic location, income and ethnic characteristics of district ECFE participants, as well as district interest in participating. Three urban, five suburban, and six rural Minnesota school districts participated:

Urban	*Suburban*	*Rural*
Duluth	Anoka-Hennepin	Fergus Falls
Minneapolis	Bloomington-Richfield	Forest Lake
St. Paul	Chaska	Freshwater Education District
	Robbinsdale	Mankato
	Shakopee	Moorhead
		Winona

Site Evaluators

Twenty-eight ECFE staff members from the 14 districts served as data collectors. All site evaluators were trained in interviewing, observation, videotaping and analysis. Site evaluators also participated in the pilot phase of the evaluation and helped revise data collection strategies. Support available to these evaluators included detailed evaluation guides prepared for each round of data collection, access to Marsha Mueller or Betty Cooke for technical assistance, and evaluation workshops held four times during the evaluation.

In addition to data collection and analysis, site evaluators completed detailed technical notes on their work. Evaluators also responded to several surveys designed to monitor their reactions to the process and document preliminary conclusions about families and recommendations for program change. Site evaluators or their districts received a nominal honorarium.

Sampling

Sampling challenge. A sampling strategy was needed to identify lower-income families new to ECFE in a very short time. To limit these families' contact with ECFE before baseline data were collected, they had to be identified and involved as soon as possible. In addition, the sampling strategy had to accommodate flexible enrollment practices. Participation in ECFE is voluntary, and in many programs families can enroll at any time during the 10-month program year, although most do so in the fall. Enrollment is not restricted. Any family may enroll in ECFE and remain in the program as long as the child participating with the parent has not entered kindergarten.

Sampling strategy and family involvement. A purposeful sampling strategy was used to identify families. An enrollment survey, which included demographic questions, was completed by families new to ECFE during the first six weeks of the 1994-1995 school year. Site evaluators recruited four to six of the earliest survey respondents to participate in the evaluation. Families were selected based on their reported income, ethnicity and willingness to participate in interviews soon after enrolling. Families meeting these criteria were told about the purpose of the evaluation and what their participation would involve. In exchange for their commitment, each family received a $25 gift certificate following both rounds of data collection and a copy of the video observations.

Ten of the 14 districts collected enrollment surveys from all new participants in their districts during the six week survey period. Four districts (Minneapolis, St. Paul, Shakopee and Chaska) focused survey and recruitment efforts at program sites that serve lower-income communities. In these four districts, it was not feasible to implement a survey of all new enrollees.

Sampling results. Enrollment surveys were completed by 711 families new-to-ECFE. (See Appendix 1, page 93, for information about response rates). Over 60 percent of the 711 new families at study sites reported incomes less than $30,000, and 37 percent reported incomes less than $20,000. Most fall survey respondents were white (86 percent). The 14 percent who indicated other backgrounds included African American (6.1 percent), Asian (3.9 percent), American Indian (2.3 percent), and Hispanic (1.3 percent).

One hundred and fifty families of the families with reported incomes less than $30,000 were selected to participate in the evaluation. Table 2 provides information about reported incomes and ethnicity of the 150 participating families.

Table 2: Income and Ethnicity of Families Participating in the Evaluation (n=150)

Reported Income	Percent of Families
$0 - $9,999	39%
$10,000 - $19,999	33%
$20,000 - $29,999	28%
Ethnicity	
White (non-Hispanic)	83%
Asian Pacific Islander	6%
American Indian	5%
African American	4%
Hispanic	3%

Study participants compared to other low-income respondents. Demographic data were analyzed to find out whether the 150 families recruited for the evaluation were different in significant ways from other lower-income respondents who completed the fall survey. Willingness to be involved and participate in the evaluation process can affect the evaluation's credibility. However, it was important to know whether families differed in significant ways at the outset. Appendix 2, page 94, reports demographic characteristics of all respondents and highlights information about lower-income respondents and families involved in the evaluation. This section and the next point out attributes of study families which might influence how findings are interpreted and used.

The results of the chi square analysis showed that the 150 families in the study were comparable to other lower-income survey respondents with respect to education, employment status, number in household, ethnicity, residency in neighborhood, parent concerns, and number of critical events. The study group was not comparable to other lower-income respondents with respect to income, marital status, age, length of time at current address, and gender ($p<.05$). Study participants reported lower family incomes, were more likely never married, and were younger than other lower-income respondents. In addition, almost all study participants were female. (See Appendix 3, page 99 chi square test results).

Regional comparisons of study participants. It was also important to know whether regional differences existed among the 150 families in the study. Some regional differences were anticipated given demographic patterns in Minnesota--for example, greater ethnic diversity in urban districts and higher numbers of employed parents in suburban districts. Although there was variation among regions, the results of the chi square analysis showed the regional study groups were comparable for the 12 attributes

included in the analysis. Characteristics of the study group and variations among regions, are described in detail beginning on page 32.

Sampling conclusion. The 150 families, although similar in some respects to other low-income families in ECFE, tended to have lower incomes, were less likely to be married, and more likely to have moved within the past year. Findings about study group participants should be helpful in understanding what we can expect for low-income female parents participating in ECFE for one program year--a good sample for examining the primary issues of this evaluation.

Data Collection

Data Collection--Process. Data collection focused on the parent and child participating together in ECFE. Study families were involved in two open-ended interviews and two or three videotaped observations as soon as possible following enrollment in ECFE. In most cases, the parent was first interviewed and then videotaped engaging their child in play at home. Following the in-home interview, the parent and child were videotaped at the program site during parent-child interaction time. Children old enough to separate from their mother were also videotaped during the child-only guided play and learning time. Finally, the parent was invited back to the program site to view and comment on the videotapes (Stimulated Response Interview). The same procedure was used in the spring of 1995.

Due to scheduling conflicts, some families completed interviews and observations at program sites. Site evaluators conducted all interviews and were responsible for videotaping. Some evaluators brought a colleague with them to the in-home interviews to provide child care for siblings during interviews, and some trained colleagues to assist with site videotaping. Both the parent and stimulated response interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for analysis.

Data Collection--Strategies. Three primary and one supplementary data collection strategies were used and are described here. Table 3 shows data collection strategies used to address specific evaluation questions. Copies of all strategies are included in Appendix 4, beginning on page102.

Enrollment Survey. The enrollment survey was used to identify families for the evaluation and to obtain basic categorical information. In addition to socioeconomic questions, the Fall Enrollment Survey solicited information about social support and family stress. The Spring Enrollment Survey omitted demographic questions and asked participants to assess their ECFE experience. In the spring of 1995, districts attempted to contact all families who had completed Fall Enrollment Surveys.

Parent Interview. The Fall Parent Interview included 15 open-ended questions. The interview provided information about how parents talk about their child's development, how well they understand child development and parenting issues, and how they perceive their role in supporting growth and development. The Spring Parent Interview included several additional questions asking how parent-child interactions had changed, if at all, and what difference participation in ECFE made for the parent or family. Parent interview questions from the Phase I evaluation (Cooke, 1992) were modified for use in this evaluation.

Videotaped Observations. Up to three different observations were recorded in the fall and spring:

(1) *In-home parent-child interaction.* During the in-home observation parents were instructed to engage their child in play for 10-15 minutes. A basket of age-appropriate toys was brought to the home for use if parents desired.

(2) *Program site parent-child interaction.* The program site observation was taped during parent-child interaction time. This observation focused on parents interacting with their children when other parents and children were present.

(3) *Child-only observation.* Older children (approximately 18 months to 3 years) were videotaped for ten minutes during ECFE child-only sessions. Older children are typically involved in play and learning activities while their parents meet with other parents and the parent educator. The child-only video segments provided parents an opportunity to observe their children acting alone or with other children.

Stimulated Response Interview (SRI). Following home and program observations, parents viewed videotaped segments during an interview conducted by the site evaluator. The purpose of the interview was to understand how parents describe and interpret the behavior they viewed on the video. Site evaluators reviewed videotapes and selected one ninety second segment from each of the in-home and program site videos for the parents to view. Site evaluators were instructed to select information-rich segments; segments which captured parent-child interactions they would expect parents to observe and comment on given their exposure to ECFE.

Supplementary Strategies. Data were collected from family educators at study sites about the number of hours parents participated in different kinds of ECFE activities. Family educators completed participation records for study families. In addition, program descriptions were prepared by all evaluation sites.

Table 3: Data Collection Strategies

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Strategy	Data Source	When Collected
To what extent are lower-income families entering ECFE programs at study sites and what are their characteristics?	• Fall Enrollment Survey	Parents new to ECFE	Fall 1994
What knowledge and skills do lower-income parents bring to ECFE? (Staff assessment.)	Fall Interviews • Parent Interview • Stimulated Response Interview	 Study families Study families	Fall 1994
How do independent raters assess parents' behavior (parent-child interaction) at the beginning of the program?	• Parent Behavior Rating Scale	Study families (videotaped observations)	Fall 1994
To what extent and in what ways are lower-income parents involved in ECFE programs? How do families assess their ECFE experience?	• Participation Record • Spring Enrollment Survey	ECFE programs Parents new to ECFE	Monthly (9/94-5/ 95) Spring 1995
What can we learn about outcomes? What kinds of outcomes do parents report? How do staff assess changes in parent knowledge and skill? How do independent raters assess end of program parent behavior?	Spring Interviews • Spring Parent Interview • Spring Stimulated Response Interview • Parent Behavior Rating Scale	 Study families Study families Study families (videotaped observations)	 Spring 1995 Spring 1995 Spring 1995

Analysis Approach

Analysis strategies for primary data collection are described here. Appendix 5, beginning on page118, includes all coding, scoring and rating forms used for both interview and observation data.

Interview data. Site evaluators analyzed interview transcripts using a coding scheme developed by Marsha Mueller based on analysis themes which emerged in the 1992, Phase I evaluation. During analysis workshops, following each round of data collection, site evaluators exchanged data sets and audited their colleagues' work. A trained university assistant reviewed all transcript coding and made final coding decisions. Marsha Mueller and Betty Cooke reviewed a sample of the assistant's coding to assess coding consistency.

Interview response codes reflect concepts which are central to ECFE work with parents (for example, parent understanding of child's behavior, child guidance strategies used by the parent, and parent roles) and parent skill level (low, medium or high).

Observation data. Both beginning and end of program video observations were assessed using a modified form of the Parent Behavior Rating Scale first developed by Gerald Mahoney and Amy Powell in1985. Most recent modifications to the scale were made by Betty Cooke for this evaluation based on adaptions made by Ruth Thomas, Lorraine Anderson, Linde Getahun, and Cooke in1992.

The modified Parent Behavior Rating Scale provides an assessment of parenting behavior in parent-child interaction on nine concepts well documented in child development research. The scale describes five levels for each of the nine concepts. Independent ratings were made by two trained research assistants who are doctoral candidates from the University of Minnesota's Institute of Child Development. (See Appendix 5.7, page143, for background on the Parent Behavior Rating Scale).

Survey data. Responses to both enrollment surveys were analyzed to obtain a general descriptive profile of lower-income families new to ECFE and families participating in the evaluation.

Participation data. Participation data were summarized to determine number of hours of exposure parents had to different kinds of ECFE activities.

Change analysis and identification of outcome themes. A major purpose of this evaluation was to learn about parent outcomes: what kind of improvement occurs and from whose perspective. The primary focus of change analysis was to assess improvements in parent behavior and parent-child interaction.

Data entry and processing. All data entry for the evaluation was managed by Dave Eide, Education Data Management, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning. Data processing was managed by Elisabeth Palmer and Rossana Armson at the Minnesota Center for Survey Research, University of Minnesota. Both Elisabeth Palmer and Michael Patton served as technical consultants for the change analysis.

What We Learned About Families-- Evaluation Findings

The findings reported in this section are organized by evaluation question. Major findings are bulleted. "Comments" which appear in different places serve as a discussion of findings and introduce additional information for consideration.

To what extent are lower-income families enrolling in ECFE?

Findings reported in pages 31 through 39 are based on parent responses to the Fall Enrollment Survey.

- **Lower-income families represented 58 percent of all new ECFE participants at study sites.** During the first six weeks of 1994 fall programming, 58 percent of the new families completing surveys in the 14 study districts reported incomes less than $30,000. In the 10 districts which did not limit surveying efforts to specific sites, lower-income family enrollments were similar (56 percent). Urban and rural districts had higher percentages of lower-income families enrolling in early fall than suburban districts. Lower-income families comprised more than 60 percent of urban and rural enrollments and 48 percent of suburban enrollments. Table 4 shows the regional enrollment patterns of lower-income families for all study districts and for districts which did not limit surveying to specific program sites.

Table 4: Lower-income Family Interest in ECFE

	Total	Regional		
		City	Suburban	Rural
14 Study Districts:*	n=409	n=128	n=132	n=149
$0 - $9,999	33%	39%	29%	32%
$10,000 - $19,999	27%	27%	29%	27%
$20,000 - $29,999	40%	34%	42%	42%
10 Study Districts:**	n=323	n=54	n=120	n=149
$0 - $9,999	30%	24%	31%	32%
$10,000 - $19,999	25%	19%	26%	27%
$20,000 - $29,999	45%	57%	43%	42%

*Includes 4 districts that limited survey efforts to selected sites.

**Districts surveyed all enrollees new to ECFE.

Comment--What We Know About Reported Incomes Of All ECFE Families From 1994 State Enrollment Data

During the 1994-1995 program year, 36 percent of ECFE participants from all Minnesota school districts reported family incomes less than $30,000. More city and rural ECFE families reported incomes less than $30,000 than suburban participants. In Duluth, Minneapolis and St. Paul, 59 percent of all ECFE families reported incomes less than $30,000; in rural districts, 40 percent; and in suburban districts, 21 percent. Statewide income data do not distinguish between families new to ECFE and returning families.

Differences in reported incomes between study districts and statewide figures are expected due to the sampling strategy used in this evaluation. Districts participating in this study were purposely selected because of their higher than average enrollments of lower-income families.

What are the characteristics of lower-income families enrolling in ECFE?

This section provides a descriptive overview of study families. Although the 150 families are comparable in different regions of the state, there are variations. The intent of the discussion is to highlight both common themes and differences.

Profile of a Study Parent

A profile is presented here to introduce and personalize the statistics that are reported in this section. A hypothetical parent, "Alice," is described based on what we learned about characteristics of study families from the Fall Enrollment Survey.

"Alice"

Alice, a twentysomething white mother, is unemployed and has one or two children. Her family's income is less than $20,000 per year. Alice shares parenting duties with someone and has completed some education beyond high school. Alice has either never been married or is divorced or separated. Alice's family has resided at their current address less than a year, although they have lived in their community somewhat longer. Within the past year her family has moved, experienced a significant

decrease in income and serious money problems. She is concerned about raising her children, making ends meet, and how her job as a parent changes as her children get older.

Despite her concerns and issues, Alice spends time frequently with her family and is satisfied with the way they get along, as well as the way things are going. However, she is not satisfied with the amount of time she can call her own. Alice has friends, neighbors or relatives with whom she exchanges help such as babysitting, help in emergencies, advice, occasional meals, and transportation--she gives help to others about as often as she receives help. She is generally satisfied with her social contacts but would like to spend more time with other parents.

Parents' Characteristics--General Patterns

• Almost all study parents were females (98 percent) and reported incomes less than $20,000 per year (72 percent). Many study parents had completed education beyond high school (65 percent), were between 20-29 years old (63 percent) and were unmarried (54 percent). Most parents (69 percent) had children between 13 months and 2 years of age, and 64 percent reported three to four people living in their household. Over half of the study families (53 percent) had lived at their current address less than a year.

Gender. Almost all parents participating in the evaluation are female (98 percent).

Marital status. Most study parents (54 percent) have either never been married or are divorced or separated. As a group, 46 percent reported being married, 39 percent never married, and 15 percent divorced or separated. Although the percentage of study families reported being married was similar across all regions, there was some regional variation in groups reporting non-married status. A higher percent of rural and city parents reported never being married (44 percent and 46 percent respectively) than suburban parents (29 percent). A higher percentage of suburban parents reported being divorced or separated (26 percent) compared to city parents (10 percent) or rural parents (9 percent).

Age. Most parents (63 percent) reported their age between 20-29. Over a fifth (28 percent) were between 30-39 and very few parents were less than 20 (2 percent) or over 40 (2 percent).

Ethnicity. Most parents were white (83 percent) although there were regional differences which reflect population trends in Minnesota. In the cities, 66 percent of the parents were white compared to 93 percent in the suburbs and 83 percent in rural

Minnesota. Parents reporting other backgrounds included Asians (6 percent), African Americans (4 percent), Native Americans (5 percent), and Hispanics (3 percent).

Income. Most study families (72 percent) reported annual incomes under $20,000. More rural and urban families (76 percent and 74 percent respectively) reported incomes under $20,000 than suburban families (66 percent).

Education. As a group, most parents (65 percent) said they had completed education beyond high school. Half (51 percent) had some college, 9 percent had a bachelor's degree, and 5 percent reported having a graduate or professional degree. Almost one-fifth of the parents had finished high school, 14 percent had some high school and 1 percent reported their education as 8th grade or less. There was some regional variation in reported education. In general, city parents reported more years of school completed than suburban or rural parents. A higher percentage of city and suburban parents reported education beyond high school (73 percent and 68 percent respectively) compared to rural parents (53 percent). However, more suburban and city parents reported less than high school education (19 and 18 percent respectively) than rural parents (11 percent).

Employment. Half of the parents reported being unemployed and not seeking employment. Thirty-nine percent were employed either full or part time and 12 percent were seeking employment. More suburban parents reported employment (53 percent) than rural or city parents (32 and 29 percent respectively). In addition, more city and rural parents indicated they were looking for jobs (18 and 15 percent respectively) than suburban parents (4 percent).

Family size. Most parents (64 percent) reported living with three to four people in their household. The average family size was 3.7 and the range was from 2 to 8 people. In addition, most parents (69 percent) reported having children who were between 13 months and 2 years old.

Residency. Most parents reported living at their current address less than a year (53 percent), although they had lived in their community more than a year (67 percent). The number of families living at their current address for less than a year was highest for city families (62 percent), compared to approximately half of the suburban and rural parents. More suburban families reported living in their community less than a year (45 percent) than city parents (33 percent) or rural parents (22 percent).

Parent Concerns and Family Issues

• Most parents were concerned about money (68 percent) and their children (53 percent). Within the past year 54 percent of the parents had moved and over 40 percent experienced a significant decrease in income and/or serious money problems.

Parent Concerns. Most parents, over 50 percent, reported concerns about money and their children. As a group, most parents were concerned about making ends meet (68 percent), raising children (53 percent), feeling lonely (49 percent) and their changing role as a parent as their child gets older (46 percent). One-third of the parents had concerns about their own health and providing for their children (30 percent). Some parents (23 percent) had concerns about contacting schools. Urban parents expressed more concerns than suburban or rural parents. Thirty-one percent of urban parents indicated five or more concerns, compared to 16 percent of suburban parents and 9 percent of rural parents. See Table 5.

Table 5: Parent Concerns (n=150)

Concerns:	Percent Reporting Concern
Making ends meet	68%
Caring for or raising your children	53%
Feeling lonely	49%
Understanding how your job as a parent changes as your child grows	46%
Your own health and well-being	33%
Providing food and clothing for your children	30%
Making contact with schools or teachers	23%
Number of Different Concerns Reported:	Percent
0	12%
1-2	41%
3-4	30%
5+	17%

Family Issues. Parents noted issues their family had experienced in the past year. The 15 events included such items as money, financial issues, entering a new school, pregnancy and birth of youngest child, changes in marital status, health issues, and death. Most families (63 percent) said they had experienced three issues or less. The most common issues included moving to a new location, substantial decrease in income and serious money problems. Almost a quarter of the families (24 percent) reported four to

five issues, and 14 percent reported six or more issues. The number of different issues reported by parents was similar across regions. See Table 6.

Table 6: Family Issues (n=150)

Critical Events	Percent Reporting
Moved to a new location	54%
Income decreased substantially	42%
Serious money problems	41%
Entered new school	33%
Birth of youngest child	28%
Pregnancy	26%
Separation from spouse or partner	23%
Trouble providing children with clothing or shoes	14%
Death of immediate family member	11%
Chronic illness or disability	9%
Alcohol or drug problem	7%
Divorce	6%
Death of parent	5%
Trouble with teachers at school	3%
Home destroyed	1%
Number of Different Events Reported:	Percent
0	10%
1-2	34%
3-4	32%
5-6	18%
7+	6%

Parents' Perspectives on Family Life

- **Most parents (83 percent) were satisfied with family life. Eighty percent reported spending time with their families on a regular basis, and 49 percent shared parenting duties with someone else. Sixty percent were dissatisfied with the amount of time they could call their own.**

Most parents share parenting duties with someone else and are satisfied with the help they receive caring for their children. Approximately half of the parents (49 percent) share parenting with their spouse or partner. Over a quarter (29 percent) had sole responsibility for parenting, and 22 percent shared parenting with someone else such as their mother, partner or other relative.

Most parents (80 percent) reported they spend time together as a family once a week or more and are satisfied with the way their family gets along (83 percent). In addition, most (73 percent) are satisfied with the way things are going for their families.

Many parents, however, are not satisfied with the amount of time they can call their own. Almost half of the parents (49 percent) spend time on their own enjoyment or recreation less than once a month. Most parents (60 percent) are dissatisfied with the time they have to pursue their own interests.

Parents' Social Support

- **Most parents (80 percent) reported having social contacts outside the home, although for many (40 percent) their contacts are limited. Parents were satisfied with their contacts and give help to others as often as they receive help. Most parents, however, would like to spend more time with other parents (60 percent).**

Most parents, approximately 80 percent or more, have someone they talk to at least once a month about new or interesting things their child is doing; their own interests, ideas or future; and parenting or child rearing concerns. Many parents, approximately 55-70 percent, have someone they talk to about personal problems or concerns; are involved in school, work, or their community, and spend time with other parents of young children once a month or more.

About 40 percent of the parents reported infrequent social contact outside the home. Around 20 percent are never involved outside the home or spend time with other parents, and another 20 percent do so less than once a month.

In general, parents are satisfied with the advice they receive from others about child rearing or personal problems. Most parents (60 percent), however, are dissatisfied with the amount of contact they have with other parents.

Most parents have social relationships characterized by balanced reciprocity. Parents reported both receiving and giving help to others in several ways. On average, families give and receive help in five different ways. Most families (80 percent or more) give help with babysitting and in emergencies and also receive help with babysitting. Families are least likely to give or receive help with regular child care. Over half of the families give and receive help with transportation; child rearing advice; tangible items such as clothes, furniture or toys; and meals or food. See Table 7.

Slightly more families indicated they never gave help (23 percent) than those who never received help (19 percent). No families reported they never gave and never received help of any kind.

Table 7: Parent Reciprocity (n=150)

Gave help once a month or more:	Percent	Received help once a month or more:	Percent
Babysitting	83%	Babysitting	90%
Help in emergencies	82%	Advice	77%
Advice	70%	Provide clothes, furniture, toys	70%
Transportation	67%	Help in emergencies	64%
Meals or food	67%	Meals or food	56%
Provide clothes, furniture, toys	65%	Transportation	52%
Regular child care	39%	Regular child care	45%
Never give help	23%	Never receive help	19%

Comment--How ECFE Interprets And Uses Information About Families

ECFE's philosophy and focus can be understood, in part, by how information about families is interpreted and used. The kind of information reported in this section is used to plan programs for parents, understand enrollment trends and describe participants to others. Day-to-day work with families, however, emphasizes understanding specific parents and children who come to ECFE.

In working with individual families, family educators emphasize identifying, building on and supporting family strengths to make parents more effective. This does not mean ignoring issues parents or children may face. Programs routinely provide referrals and information to help adults and children. Formal and informal linkages to other programs and services enable ECFE to remain focused on its primary mission--to strengthen the ability of parents to parent.

This approach is supported by emerging child development research which sheds light on the interplay of risks and opportunities in children's lives. James Garbarino (1995) summarized the research in the following way:

> *. . .[T]he presence or absence of any single risk factor rarely tells us much about a child's prospects in life. Rather, it is the accumulation of risk factors that jeopardizes development. The presence of one or two factors does not developmentally disable children, but the accumulation of three, four or more can*

overwhelm a child--particularly when these risk factors accumulate without a parallel accumulation of opportunity factors. . .As risk factors accumulate, intellectual development suffers and children cannot bring to bear cognitive strength in mastering the challenges they face. . .A child with three risk factors and three opportunity factors generally does much better than a child with the same risk factors but no such ameliorating set of opportunity factors. (1995, p.151-154)

Garbarino goes on to emphasize that individual and accumulated risk factors do not predict negative child outcomes. *"It depends. It depends upon social context. People can overcome a great deal if the social environment favors them in this struggle."*

Supporting and nurturing opportunities for children in families, schools and communities can effectively balance risk. This, in effect, is the underlying philosophy or theory of action of ECFE programs. ECFE focuses its work on supporting and strengthening parent-child relationships, a critical opportunity factor for children.

What Knowledge and Skills Do Parents Bring to ECFE?

Background

The mission of ECFE is to strengthen families and support the ability of parents to parent. In their work with families, program staff emphasize helping parents understand their children, effective parenting behavior and the dynamics of parent-child interaction. Their work is grounded in accepted knowledge from child development, family research and education. Implicit in the ECFE approach is the assumption that active learning and practice sets the stage for positive change in parenting knowledge and behavior. Parents and children come together to ECFE where activities emphasize parent-child interaction.

The challenge for ECFE family educators is to serve as effective translators or consultants. Family educators must work hard to understand each family and their unique situations to support parents in meaningful ways. To work effectively, family educators must make *judgments* about what parents bring to programs; specifically, parents' knowledge and skills as well as how parents interact with their children. Judgments are typically based on what parents say and how they interact with their children during program activities.

In this evaluation, systematic means were used by staff (ECFE site evaluators) and independent raters to make judgments about what parents bring to programs. Staff assessments were based on parent interviews and independent raters' assessments were based on videotaped observations of parents interacting with their children. This section reports what we learned about parents' knowledge and behavior when they enrolled in ECFE. Findings focus on the 118 parents who completed the evaluation. Staff and independent raters' assessments about what families bring to ECFE are reported separately.

Staff Assessment of What Parents Bring to ECFE

Concepts of Interest. The description provided here about both concepts and skill level is important now in understanding what parents bring to programs and later in understanding what we learned about change.

Staff judgments about parents were based on information from parent interviews and the stimulated response interviews. Together these interviews focused on four

concept areas central to work with families and intended outcomes for families participating in ECFE. Concept areas, desired outcomes, and general indicators are listed here.

Concept Area	*Desired Outcome*	*Indicators*
Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child	Parents display knowledge and awareness of their own child which reflects basic understanding of child development and age-appropriate behavior.	How parents talk about and describe child's behavior. How parents talk about child behavior they observe.
Parent Behavior	Parents interact with their children in ways which support healthy growth and development.	How parents interact with their child and how they describe their interactions; including parent self-control, child guidance strategies, and sensitivity and responsiveness to their child.
Parent Role Perception	Parents think about and describe how they view their purpose and role. Parents think about and anticipate how their role changes as their children grow.	How parents describe their purpose and the work they do as a parent; in broad terms and in specific situations.
Parent Self-Assessment	Parents reflect on their own strengths and weaknesses and growth as a parent.	Parent assessments of their own behavior.

Interview questions related to the four concept areas are listed in Table 8. Parent responses were coded and scored low, medium or high depending on how their responses compared to ECFE outcomes. For example, *low* scores were assigned to parent responses reflecting developmentally inappropriate knowledge of child development or uncertainty about what they do as a parent or their own child's behavior. *Medium* scores were assigned to responses demonstrating basic and appropriate child development knowledge or parenting behavior. A *high* score was assigned when the parent response reflected a relatively sophisticated understanding of child development and parenting skill. High scores reflect integration of developmentally appropriate knowledge and awareness of their child's behavior in relation to themselves and others. ECFE programs work toward and support parent development at the medium and high level. See Appendix 5, pages 130-136, for critical codes used to distinguish low, medium and high scores.

Table 8: Concept Areas and Interview Questions

Concept Area/ Question Focus	Interview Question	Source
Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child:		
Child description	*Tell me about your child. . .What's(child's name) like? Your child is (age) years old. What are (age) year olds like?*	Parent Interview
Child learning	*Children grow and change very quickly and they learn in different ways. What have you noticed recently about how (child's name) learns?*	Parent Interview
Observation of own child	**What was happening here? What kinds of things did you notice? What are your reactions to what you saw? What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?*	Stimulated Response Interview
Parent Behavior:		
Parent self-control	*We know there are times when all parents feel really full of love for their child and other times when we don't feel so loving; when we're really frustrated. We also know we behave differently depending on how we feel. What do you do when you don't feel so loving--you know, when your patience is the size of a pea?*	Parent Interview
Guidance	*How do you try to get your child to do what you want him/her to do?*	Parent Interview
Sensitivity/Responsiveness	*We've talked about what you do when you feel frustrated, now I want you to tell me what you do when your child feels angry or frustrated. What do you do when your child seems angry or frustrated?*	Parent Interview
Parent-Child Interaction (home observation)	**What was happening here? What kinds of things did you notice? What are your reactions to what you saw on the video?*	Stimulated Response Interview
Parent-child interaction (program observation)	**What was happening here? What kinds of things did you notice? What are your reactions to what you saw on the video?*	Stimulated Response Interview
Parent Role Perception:		
Description	*What kinds of words would you use to describe your job as (child's name) parent?*	Parent Interview
Purpose	*Now tell me what you're trying to accomplish when you do those things; what is it that you feel you're working toward when you do your parenting job?*	Parent Interview
Anticipation of how role changes.	*I would like you to tell me how you think your job as a parent will change. In a few years (child's name) will start kindergarten. In what ways do you feel your job as a parent will change when you have a school age child?*	Parent Interview
Description observation of parent role in specific situation.	**Do you remember when I first interviewed you and I asked you to describe your job as (child's name) parent? When you think back about what you've just watched on the video, what words would you use to describe what you're doing as (child's name) parent?*	Stimulated Response Interview
Parent Self Assessment:		
Strengths	*We've found that most parents have some things they feel they do well as a parent, and some things they don't feel they do so well. What do you do well as a parent?*	Parent Interview
Weaknesses	*What do you not do so well as a parent?*	Parent Interview

*These questions were asked after parents viewed the videotaped observations of themselves and their children interacting in their home and at the program site. All other questions were asked during the parent interview.

Findings--Staff Assessments of Knowledge and Skills Lower-Income Parents Bring to ECFE

• Parents come to ECFE displaying both strengths and weaknesses. Staff assessed most parents as displaying medium level knowledge or skill in two concept areas: parent self-assessment (71 percent rated medium) and knowledge/awareness of own child (52 percent rated medium). Most parents received lower ratings for parent behavior (69 percent) and parent role perception (61 percent).

When study families enrolled in ECFE, most parents displayed both strengths and weaknesses. In general, 52 percent of parents displayed a medium understanding and awareness of their own child, and 71 percent displayed a medium level assessment of their own performance as a parent. On the other hand, most parents displayed low levels of parenting behavior (69 percent) and understanding of their parenting role (61 percent). Table 9 shows the distribution of fall interview scores (staff judgments about parent knowledge and skills) for the four concept areas. Concept area scores were adjusted for missing responses and represent an average score for all concept area questions.

Table 9: Fall Interview Scores (n=118)

Concept Area:	*Fall Interview Scores*		
	Percent Low	Percent Medium	Percent High
Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child	39%	52%	10%
Parent Self Assessment	25%	71%	4%
Parent Role Perception	61%	40%	---
Parent Behavior	69%	30%	1%

Concept area scores illustrate general patterns of strengths and weaknesses. Table 10 shows the predominant pattern of parent skill levels for all 14 items included in the fall staff assessment. Table 11 shows the percentage of parents exhibiting low skill levels for the 14 items.

Table 10: Predominant Fall Skill Level Patterns (n=118)

Question Focus	Percent	Rating
Parent self assessment--strengths	82%	Medium
Parent role--purpose	81%	Medium
Knowledge--child learning	69%	Medium
Parent role--anticipation of how role changes	69%	Medium
Parent role--description of parent role in video	67%	Medium
Parent behavior--self control	63%	Medium
Parent self assessment--weaknesses	60%	Medium
Knowledge--observation of own child	59%	High
Parent behavior--home interaction	57%	Medium
Parent behavior--sensitivity/responsivity	56%	Medium
Parent behavior--program interaction	56%	Medium
Parent behavior--guidance	54%	Low
Parent role--description	51%	Low
Knowledge--child description	48%	Medium

Table 11: Percentage of Parents Exhibiting Low Skill Levels (n=118)

Question Focus	Percent Low
Parent behavior--guidance	54%
Parent role--description	51%
Parent behavior--sensitivity/responsivity	39%
Knowledge--child description	33%
Parent behavior--self control	31%
Parent behavior--home interaction	30%
Knowledge--observation of own child	29%
Parent behavior--program interaction	28%
Parent role--description of parent role in video observation	24%
Parent role--anticipation of how role changes	23%
Knowledge--child learning	18%
Parent role--purpose	17%
Parent self assessment--strengths	15%

Examples of parent responses representing different skill levels are presented here by concept area.

Examples of Rating Levels: Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child

Low Level--Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child
Parent discussion about 6-month-old daughter.

Parent's description of child: *[Six-month-old daughter] She explores. We're crabby a lot. She's real fun.*

Parent's general description of what children are like at this age: *Not active at all. She's real active compared to other six-month-olds.*

Parent's description of how her child learns: *She learns fast. She don't do what I do yet, she not old enough for that yet. She has learned a lot of stuff fast.*

Parent's discussion of child-only video segment:

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Child placed next to activity table. Touches objects. Chews on objects. Another child comes over, touches child. Child crawls away, goes to another toy, chews on it.	What was happening here? *She didn't really notice I was gone. She plays well with other kids. I don't like when she fell. She looked around to make sure somebody was there watching her in case she was hurt.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *It's cute. I like the way she plays with other kids, without me around. She played real nice with other kids*

Medium Level--Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child
Parent discussion about 3-month-old daughter.

Parent's description of child: *She's moody. She knows what she wants. She definitely has her moods. It's us figuring out what she wants. When she's not happy that's what we do.*

Parent's general description of what children are like at this age: *It's fun. It's definitely starting to be fun. Way, way before there's not much you can do with them. She's smiling and laughing and wants to play and getting herself on a sleep schedule.*

Parent's description of how her child learns: *A lot right now is her getting familiar with her body. She's realizing that her hands belong to her. Her feet belong to her. She's learning to grasp things, play with things, put things into her mouth. That's her big thing right now.*

Parent's discussion of child-only video segment:

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Daughter on the floor.	What was happening here? *She was tired again.* What was your reaction? *I hate hearing her cry. It's a lot of crying.*

High Level--Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child

Parent discussion about 3-year-old son.

Parent's description of child: *He's a rambunctious three-year-old. He runs from the time he gets up to the time he goes to bed. He likes a lot of things. He likes trains, planes, cars, soccer. He's a little bit shy around strangers.*

Parent's general description of what children are like at this age: *They think everything is theirs and if you get it, they want it. They'll be helpful if you ask them to, usually. If you give him a spray bottle, he'll wash the walls, but he'll unload his toy box just as fast. Loves to be read to.*

Parent's description of how her child learns: *He watches and copies. He watches his sisters doing something and figures he has to do it too. He asks a lot of questions.*

Parent's discussion of child-only video segment:

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Son and friend are building peg towers. Son leaves to go to the train and another friend follows. Son picks up the train pieces. Friend looks and whines that he wants some. Son watches. Friend leaves whining.	What was happening here? *On the first part he was playing with pegs with a group of four children, not really interacting but playing kind of side by side. Then he moved on to the wooden train set and another boy followed him and his friend. [They] seen (sic) this little boy coming so he gathered all the train parts to himself and then acted like he was building the train set.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *Oh, it was funny. He's not very good with sharing. At his age everything is mine and it was that way with the other boy, too.*

Examples of Rating Levels: Parent Self-Assessment

Low Level--Parent Self-Assessment
Parent of 3-year-old son.

Parent's description of her strengths: *I'm more nicer than daddy. He [3-year-old son] gets by with more with me than daddy.*

Parent's description of her weaknesses: *I get very upset. He [three-year-old son] likes to push me. He has to push it and push it and push it. And it makes me madder and I spank him.*

Medium Level--Parent Self-Assessment
Parent of 19-month-old son.

Parent's description of her strengths: *Teach him the right things.*

Parent's description of her weaknesses: *Patience. I'm not a patient person, so I have to deal with that a lot.*

High Level--Parent Self-Assessment
Parent of 2 1/2-year-old daughter.

Parent's description of her strengths: *I think I'm real creative and I'm good at creating fun situations. And I feel like I'm real honest with the kids. I'm glad that I have the time that I have to spend with my kids. One thing that's good about me and my kids is that I'm here and I'm involved in their lives and that's important to me. And I'm real flexible. I think that is a strength, although it can be a weakness, too.*

Parent's description of her weaknesses: *To be consistent seems to be the most challenging for me. It's like if I'm at different situations might come up and it's like, oh well, I kind of feel like I just want to go with the flow one time and another time it's like no, I want this to be this way. And I know that I need to be more consistent with it. I think I'm doing better the second time around. I was a lot more flexible when there was just one kid. So yea, consistency and another thing is not reacting to them, trying to be more detached in how I respond to them in some of the more emotionally charged situations.*

Examples of Rating Levels: Parent Role Perception

Low Level--Parent Role Perception
Parent of 2-year-old son.

Parent's description of parenting: *I try to do the best I can. I like spending time with him.*

Parent's description of purpose: *I haven't accomplished lots yet.*

Parent's description of what she is trying to accomplish in video taped observation of parent-child interaction at ECFE: *I like to get involved and to help him. Sometimes he doesn't want my help and does things on his own.*

Parent's description of how her role will change when child enters kindergarten: *I don't know. It will be kind of the same, the hours and all.*

Medium Level--Parent Role Perception

Parent of 1-year-old daughter.

Parent's description of parenting: *I guess outgoing. Me and her do a lot of stuff. I'm really loving towards her. I grew up for ten years as an only child so I kind of understand how it is to be the only one and not having anybody to play with, so I try to play with my daughter and let her know that I am there if she gets bored. Uh, concerned, I guess. Whenever she's getting into trouble, I'm always there telling her no. I like to bring her places with me.*

Parent's description of purpose: *To let my daughter know that I am someone she can always count on. As for myself, knowing that I can comfort her, it raises my self esteem and also I'm doing a good job and not being a bad role model. Uh, just let her know that I love her and that I'm always there.*

Parent's description of what she is trying to accomplish in video taped observation of parent-child interaction at ECFE. *Teaching her to, uh, teaching her how to play with kids; to get adjusted to being with other people other than just me.*

Parent's description of how her role will change when child enters kindergarten: *Oh, it will be a lot harder. She'll not be with me so much and she will be going through so many changes in school and I will have to go through them with her. It will be hard to be apart from her because I'm with her every day. But, I'm sure we'll get through it.*

High Level--Parent Role Perception

Note: A high-level example of parent role perception is not included because none of the parents' fall interview responses were rated high.

Examples of Rating Levels: Parent Behavior

Low Level--Parent Behavior
Parent of 2-year-old son.

Parent self-control; parent's description of what she does when she is frustrated: *If I feel he's getting on my nerves I'll take him up to my mom's for a little while. I'll say, let's do something or go for a ride.*

Guidance; parent's description of how she gets child to mind her: *I ask him to do it a couple of times. And if he doesn't do it, I just wait till another day and try it again.*

Sensitivity/responsivity; parent's description of what she does when child feels angry or frustrated: *Like now? [child frustrated with a toy.] I try to help him but sometimes it doesn't work at all. I try to calm him down.*

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction (in home):

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
At the toy box with his mom.	What was happening here? *I'm just watching him.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *It's just different watching him like this. It's fun.*

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction (at ECFE):

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Son playing on the plane with Mom behind him.	What was happening here? *I thought he could hold on. I think he's playing real nice with the friends.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *I think sometimes he's a loner.*

Parent of 3-year-old son.

Parent self-control; parent's description of what she does when she is frustrated: *My patience is very, very small. He doesn't mind, and I get very frustrated with that. He likes to edge me on, and I spank his butt.*

Guidance; parent's description of how she gets child to mind her: *Very hard. He don't. He don't mind his parents, but he'll mind other people.*

Sensitivity/responsivity; parent's description of what she does when child feels angry or frustrated: *He will hit. . .hit me, and I hit him back. He will pound on the wall. He will take his toys and hit his sister with them.*

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction (in home):

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Mother and son counting on the floor and looking at books.	What was happening here? *He's doing what I do. But he doesn't stay with it very long. He used to do it better then. He doesn't do it so much now.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *He doesn't do it well now but he did it better then.*

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction (at ECFE):

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Mother and son fixing tea and serving it to people.	What was happening here? *He doesn't want to do what I want him to do. But that's a good thing. He wants to do what he wants to do. And he doesn't listen to me.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *Sometimes that's good and sometimes that's not.*

Medium Level--Parent Behavior

Parent of daughter, 1 1/2-years-old.

Parent self-control; parent's description of what she does when she is frustrated: *Usually when that happens I, you know, you just kind of separate yourself, just stay away, you know, like you find something else to be doing while she's playing or just you know, you're mad about something she's done, you know, just kind of separate yourself from her.*

Guidance; parent's description of how she gets child to mind her: *One of the things that she's just having a huge fit about is getting her diaper changed, she just doesn't want to lay on the floor and do it. So, I always just sing to her and when I'm singing to her she usually will lay there and listen. So it's like you don't have to really make her do it, she kind of forgets that she doesn't want to be laying there. So that's one thing that I do with her, like getting dressed is the same way. She just does not like to get dressed, so um. . . I'll kind of let her do it at her own*

speed. If I have time to let her walk the halls, it takes an hour to walk down halls, I guess it will take an hour, but, you know, usually I just let her go at her own pace.

Sensitivity/responsivity; parent's description of what she does when child feels angry or frustrated: *I guess when she's frustrated it's usually out of being tired, if she's tired she gets frustrated really easily. So then we usually just try to put away things that are hard for her to do when she's tired and maybe read a book or settle down and get her ready for bed or get her ready for a nap. You know that's when she's the most frustrated is when she's tired.*

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction (in home):

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Child putting stringing beads in a plastic bowl and taking them out. Mom sitting by child.	What was happening here? *She was playing with the beads and I was watching to see what she would do with them. And when she wanted interaction or whatever, I let her have it [interaction].* What are your reactions to what you saw? *Oh, I think in general that's how she plays, but most of the time she plays on her own and likes to have her, you know, space and do her own thing. She will come if she wants interaction, she'll come to me with a book or something.*

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction (at ECFE):

Description of Video Segment	Parent Discussion
Child sitting in large play car. Mom sitting beside car.	What was happening here? *She's playing in the car and she was recognizing the different parts and what each part does, where the keys go. Kind of letting other kids know her territory--"it's mine"--if they get too close, with hand signals, she says back away.* What are your reactions to what you saw? *It was kind of a fun atmosphere and you could relax and she felt pretty comfortable to play there, not too worried about anything, kind of watching around at everything going on.*

High Level--Parent Behavior

An example of high-level parent behavior is not included because only one parent was rated high by staff.

Independent Rating--Parent Behavior

Background

Independent ratings of parent behavior were based on a different assessment strategy and data set than staff assessments of parent behavior. Staff assessments focused on interview data; what parents said they did and how parents talked about what they did when they viewed videotapes of themselves interacting with their child. Independent raters based their assessments only on the videotaped observations of parents interacting with their child. Raters assessed nine aspects of parent behavior included in the Parent Behavior Rating Scale: enjoyment/acceptance/warmth; sensitivity; responsivity; reciprocal engagement; pace; encouragement of sensorimotor and cognitive development; inventiveness/creativity; guidance/encouragement of self-direction; and, absence of hostility. Each scale describes five levels of parenting proficiency from one to five; one representing low and five the highest.

The analysis of independent ratings included calculation of interrater reliability and a factor analysis of the nine items to assess the appropriateness of calculating a total score. The reliability coefficient for all nine items was high (.854). This means that the two experts were similar in their ratings of parents' behavior, they did not differ significantly. For a complete discussion of the factor analysis and reliability assessment see Appendix 6, page 153.

Findings--Independent Assessment of Parent Behavior

- **According to independent ratings, lower-income parents coming to ECFE exhibited different levels of parenting behavior. Most parents (65 percent) were rated three or four on a 5-point scale. Slightly over a third received lower ratings of two or one.** Independent raters assessing parent behavior in parent-child interactions rated 53 percent of the parents as three, 33 percent were rated two, 12 percent were rated four, and 3 percent were rated one. (See Table 12.) The average rating was 26 out of a possible 40. Parents' scores ranged from 12 to 39 and the standard deviation was 5.5.

Table 12: Independent Ratings--Fall Scores on Parent Behavior Rating Scale (n=118)

Parent Skill Levels		*(percent)*
(Highest)	5	---
	4	12%
(Moderate)	3	53%
	2	33%
(Lowest)	1	3%

Descriptions of parent behaviors associated with ratings of two concepts are included here to illustrate distinctions made by independent raters when assessing video taped observations. See Appendix 5, page 145, for a complete description of all nine scales.

Enjoyment/Acceptance/Warmth

Predominant Ratings:	*Level 3 Behavior*	*Level 2 Behavior*
Description:	Parent occasionally manifests delight/interest in child being himself/herself and/or in interaction with the child. The parent expresses affection occasionally through touch and vocal tone. Only performance and unusual feats by the child are acknowledged.	Parent does not seem to enjoy or be interested in the child per se or may show little joy and delight in interaction with the child. The parent seldom expresses warmth through touch or voice tone and may not acknowledge effort.
Other Ratings:	*Level 4 Behavior*	*Level 1 Behavior*
Description:	Parent manifests delight/interest frequently and frequently expresses affection through touch and vocal tone. Parent may verbalize terms of endearment. Parent is generally enthusiastic in expressing emotions toward child and is generous with positive affect.	Parent may show an absence of interest, joy or delight in interaction with the child. Inhibited body language, flat affect, dull voice quality and unvaried facial expression may be characteristic.

Guidance/ Encouragement of Self-Direction

Predominant Ratings:	***Level 3 Behavior***	***Level 2 Behavior***
Description:	The parent's tendency to make suggestions and direct the child is about equal to the tendency to allow the child self-direction. The parent may try to influence the child's choice of activity but allows the child independence in the execution of his/her play or may let the child make his/her own choice but be ready with suggestions for effective implementation.	Interfering/intrusive. Parent often indicates what to do next or how to do it. Parent produces a steady stream of suggestive remarks and may initiate a new activity when there has been no previous sign of inertia, interest in a new activity and/or resistance shown by the child.
Other Ratings:	*Level 4 Behavior*	*Level 1 Behavior*
Description:	Parent occasionally makes suggestions of principles to follow. This parent rarely tells the child what to do. He/she may respond with advice and criticism when help is requested but in general refrains from initiating such interaction. On the whole, this parent is cooperative and non-interfering.	Very interfering/intrusive. Parent continually attempts to direct the minute details of the child's "free" play. This parent is conspicuous for the extreme frequency of interruption of the child's activity-in-progress so that the parent seems "at" the child most of the time--instructing, training, eliciting, directing, controlling.

- **Very few parents, less than 5 percent, displayed hostility toward their child.**

Independent ratings of parent behavior included an assessment of hostile behavior parents displayed toward their children. Raters were looking for overt verbal and/or nonverbal anger, inappropriate aggression or behavior that discounted or rejected the child. Almost all study parents, 95 percent, showed little or no signs of hostility, rejection or disapproval. Four percent of the parents demonstrated some hostility. In these instances parent expressions included behavior such as pulling away an object with a jerk, putting hands on hips to show exasperation, giving the child a brief cold look, or parroting or mimicking the child in a hostile fashion.

Comment--Staff Reaction To Baseline Findings About Lower-Income Families

During their review of evaluation findings, site evaluators commented about the similarity between study families and the general population of ECFE participants. Staff felt the range of characteristics, skills and abilities of study group participants mirrored those exhibited by families in the Phase I study as well as families with whom they work on a day-to-day basis. (The Phase I study included 156 parents; 58 percent reported incomes over $30,000 per year.) One site evaluator commented that "we need to examine our assumptions; low-income does not mean a family will be 'high risk' [dysfunctional or chaotic]." Generalizations and stereotypes about what "low-income" implies can do a disservice to these families.

To what extent do lower-income families participate in ECFE and how do they assess their experience?

Background

Findings about ECFE participation are based on attendance information collected about study families only. Information about how parents assess their experience was obtained from both study families and other low-income families (families who completed a Fall Enrollment Survey but who were not chosen for the evaluation). All families who completed a fall survey (both study and non-study families) were contacted again in the spring to obtain their assessment of ECFE.

Findings About Study Family Participation in ECFE

- **Study families participated in ECFE an average of 42 hours and the range was from 8 to 126 hours. All study families (100 percent) participated in parent-child classes and 44 percent reported participating in two to four other kinds of ECFE activities or services.**

Table 13 presents information about hours of exposure and different kinds of activities and services used by study families. Although the range of hours of exposure to ECFE was large (8-126 hours), most families participated 30-54 hours over six to ten months period. The average total exposure for study families was 42 hours. All families (100 percent) participated in parent-child classes, the primary mode of ECFE program delivery. In addition, 25 percent participated in special events and 20 percent received home visits.

Table13: Study Family Participation in ECFE (n=111)

Total Hours	
Average	42
Range	8-126
Standard deviation	24
Median	36
Months of Exposure	(percent of families)
6-10 months	80%
5 months or less	20%
Types of Participation	(percent of families)
Parent-Child Classes	100%
Special Events	25%
Home Visits	20%
Parent Only Classes	3%
Other	2%
Number of Different Activities/Services	(percent of families)
1	56%
2	28%
3	14%
4	2%

Comment--Staff Reaction To Participation Data

To understand how participation data for study families compared to other ECFE families, we reviewed statewide figures and asked site evaluators (family educators) their reactions to the numbers.

We found we could not compare study findings with state figures because programs report participation using different definitions and calculations than were used in the evaluation.

Site evaluators specifically noted that both the average number of hours and range were typical. One evaluator pointed out that "*many families do have contact with the program about five hours a month. Parent-child classes, for example, typically meet once a week. Parents may come once a month or three weeks out of four. Life with small children is complex, kids get sick, cars break down, in the winter weather can be a problem.*" Another evaluator stressed that families have different needs and issues. "*We work with families in different ways. Depending on their situation we may make home visits, we may help them get connected to other services . . .Some families we do spend a lot of time with.*"

• **Over 81 percent of all low-income parents responding to the spring survey reported ECFE was worthwhile, and 85 percent regarded staff as respectful and responsive.**

The Spring Enrollment Survey asked parents to rate four attributes of their ECFE program experience by checking one of four descriptive terms. Both study parents and non-study parents gave high marks to all program attributes. Parents felt staff were respectful (92 to 95 percent), responsive (85 to 86 percent), and rated ECFE as worthwhile (81 to 84 percent). Although slightly over 60 percent of parents felt ECFE covered important topics, over a third of study parents (35 percent) and non-study parents (37 percent) felt ECFE covered important topics "somewhat." See Table 14.

Table14: Parents' Assessment of ECFE

	Study Families (n=118) Percent Reported	Other Low-Income Families* (n=121) Percent Reported
Staff respectful		
A Great Deal	92%	95%
Somewhat	6%	4%
Staff responsive to my questions		
A Great Deal	86%	85%
Somewhat	13%	15%
ECFE is a worthwhile experience		
A Great Deal	84%	81%
Somewhat	15%	19%
Program covered important topics		
A Great Deal	61%	62%
Somewhat	35%	37%

*Families completing both fall and spring surveys but not selected to participate in the evaluation.

What We Learned About Immediate Outcomes--Evaluation Findings

How do Parents, Staff and Independent Raters Assess Parent Outcomes?

Background

Information about parent outcomes was obtained from parents, staff and independent raters. Parents' assessments of their change came from an analysis of responses to the Spring Enrollment Survey and questions on the Spring Parent Interview which solicited parent perspectives about change. Staff and independent rater assessments of parent change were based on a comparison of fall and spring ratings.

Parents' Assessments of Their Change

The first two findings in this section are based on analysis of responses to the Spring Enrollment Survey and include information from both study families and non-study families. The third finding is based on information from the Spring Parent Interview, which included study families only.

- **Over 92 percent of low-income parents reported that participation in ECFE made a positive difference in their confidence as a parent, social support, and knowledge and understanding of child development. In addition, 72 percent reported better relationships with their children.**

Parents were asked on the Spring Enrollment Survey whether they had observed changes in their child or made changes in their own parenting skills or behavior since coming to ECFE. Table 15 shows the percent of parents indicating ECFE made a difference in their parenting skill or child's behavior. Over 92 percent of all low-income parents felt ECFE made a difference in their confidence as a parent, social contact with other parents, and knowledge and awareness of child development. Many parents (63-72 percent) identified different ways their relationship to their child had improved.

- **Study families were more likely than other low-income parents to report improvements in their child's behavior since starting ECFE. Changes reported more often by study parents than non-study parents included children's increased independence (72 percent compared to 59 percent of non-study parents), improved language and communication skills (68 percent compared to 56 percent), improved relationships with other children (62 percent compared to 49 percent), and more self-confidence (58 percent compared to 45 percent).**

Study families were more likely than other low-income survey respondents to note changes in their child since starting ECFE (Table 15). Study families observed increased independence in their children (72 percent), improved language development and communication skills (68 percent), improved relationships with other children (62 percent), and enhanced self-confidence (58 percent). Two child outcomes were identified by most non-study low-income parents: 59 percent noted increased independence and 56 percent identified improved language development and communication skills.

Table 15: Percent of Parents Reporting Immediate Outcomes

	Study Families n=118 (reported in percent)	Other Low-Income Survey Respondents* n=121 (reported in percent)
Changes in parent behavior:		
Confidence as parent increased	95%	95%
Met other parents who have similar interests and concerns	95%	92%
Knowledge and understanding of child development increased	94%	96%
Changes in the way parent relates to child:		
Parent stops to observe, listen and think before acting with child	72%	72%
Parent more in tune to and sensitive to child's point of view.	68%	68%
Parent spends more time with child	63%	64%
No change reported	26%	17%
Changes in child behavior:		
More independent	72%	59%
Improved language development and communication skills	68%	56%
Gets along better with other children	62%	49%
More self-confidence	58%	45%
Gets along better with other adults	39%	33%
No changes in child observed	18%	13%

*Non-study families completing both fall and spring surveys.

Comment--Difference In Child Outcomes Reported By Study And Non-Study Parents

The difference in child outcomes reported by study parents and non-study parents may be due to study effects. Most site evaluators used the Stimulated Response Interview (SRI) as a teaching opportunity. After the SRI was completed, site evaluators would replay portions of the videotape and point out parent or child behaviors to illustrate educational concepts or parent-child strengths which the parent may have overlooked. Most staff felt the teaching opportunity blended well with the SRI format, helped parents develop and strengthen observation skills, and encouraged parent self- reflection. For many study families, the SRI was part of their ECFE experience.

The following finding is based on study family responses to Spring Parent Interviews.

- **Study parents reported that ECFE helped improve their strategies for child guidance and the way they manage their own frustrations. Study parents (70 percent) reported using better guidance strategies with their children, and 65 percent reported handling their own frustrations better.**

Study families were asked whether they had changed their child guidance approach or the way they related to their children when frustrated (parent self-control) since starting ECFE. Almost 70 percent of the parents said they had changed the approaches they used to get their children to mind. Most families who said they changed their approaches mentioned expanding their repertoire of appropriate strategies or improving the quality of the approaches they used. Ten percent of the parents mentioned they had stopped inappropriate practices such as ridiculing, yelling, screaming or hitting.

Results were similar for changes in parent self-control. Most parents, 65 percent, said they had changed the way they express their feelings toward their children when frustrated or angry. In most cases, parents reported changing the quality or quantity of appropriate practices. Twenty percent reported decreasing or stopping inappropriate practices.

Study families were also asked to talk about changes they observed in themselves, their children or their family attributable to ECFE. Replies were similar to the responses parents gave to the Spring Enrollment Survey questions about change. For example, parents mentioned increased feelings of social support, increased knowledge and awareness of child development, and positive changes in their child's behavior. In

addition, parents also mentioned improved relations among family members and more discussion among parents.

Samples of parent comments about the impact of ECFE on their lives are included here. In the first set of quotes, parents discuss how ECFE affected their relationships with their children or families. In the second, parents comment about the difference ECFE made in their own lives.

Sample of Parent Comments--Importance of ECFE for Child and Family

He'll play more independently. He separates a lot easier from me. He plays better with the other children. He'll play more at home now with his brothers, he'll get along with them better. He's talking more, learning to talk more.

My daughter's learned to play with other kids and to share. I've learned that I'm not the only single parent and that I've made a lot of new friends that I hope I can keep in contact after this and I've learned a lot about parenting. It's been a big help.

I've noticed [my daughter's] been able to play well with other children. My sister has a little baby and she tries to help out with him like if he's crying she'll give him his pacifier or give him a hug or a kiss. She'll just try to comfort him. With [my husband and I] I think we've been communicating more. We hardly ever talked before, now we've been communicating more and getting our feelings out sooner than we used to.

[M]y son, he's got friends now. He's grown a lot here. I've learned a lot just by listening. Actually, it's kind of a future reference thing cause nobody in my class has children my son's age. So I've learned what to do on certain things when he's 2, 3, 4. I know what's coming. I've learned a lot about that.

[ECFE] gave my daughter something important to do. That made a real difference in her life and mine. There wasn't so much competition between her and [her older sister] because she had school too. That was a big thing. I think it gave her routine, something that was constant, steady, something she didn't have before. And I think it, uh, set her up for school. That she really likes school. It's brought my daughter and I close cause we can discuss our feelings better. Cause we both learned feelings and communication. So, it was just as much for me as her learning.

Well, I think that [my child and I] get along a little better because of the, just the time that I have here talking to other moms and even though they have children a little younger it still kinda helps to vent things that other people would understand. Then I can focus and really work with my daughter where I'm not as uptight around her because I have someplace to vent it.

For both I've noticed things. [My daughter's] gotten a lot more comfortable with separation. She really enjoys going and she enjoys the projects and things. So I think she's gotten used to more of a school atmosphere and has done well there. And then it's been nice with a lot of the

things that they've presented in the parent groups to come home and talk about some of those with my husband. He's not a person that ever picks up a parenting book or even thinks about it, it's not anything that he's interested in as far as really studying it, so it's been nice to have information to talk about. And I've really enjoyed the support of other parents, too. That's been very, very helpful. You don't feel like you're all alone in those situations that you don't know, is this normal? Am I the only one that feels like life's out of control here? It's really nice to have some validation on that stuff from other parents.

Sample of Parent Comments--Difference ECFE Made in Parent's Life

Different ways of learning how to do activities at home or learning different stages that [children] go through, what they can be like. Seeing what other kids are like and comparing them and seeing if, seeing that [my son] is not much different from what other kids are like, and knowing that all parents go through the same things.

I think I've gotten better information than what I've had before on how to raise children, on how to understand the different stages they go through and how to deal with that and all.

[I've found] different solutions instead of spanking and also realized that these are little kids, they're not miniature adults, that they are kids, they're not adults and they shouldn't be talked to as adults or disciplined as adults.

I'm learning a lot from the parenting classes. If you have any problems with your kids, you just go ask [family educator] about it, she'll give you every answer she can find. We have a group, you know, and if we had any subject that we were on, like diapers, toilet training, we'd just go in and talk to the parents that's already been through the experience. And we can exchange the ideas on how it's going to be done and all that stuff, that's kind of good to know. We'll talk about the signs, like if they're any signs that they have to go to the bathroom, like diapers, like he tells you if he's wet and stuff.

I sense that I'm um, [I have] more assurance that I'm a good mom. That I do the best I can do at the time. And that there's so many moms out there. I mean, each mom does her things in her own way. My life's the program. . .It's really a good program. Cause it's not judgmental, it's not, its this way or that way, you know. Just use this guy's approach or that one, you know. [Family educators] get their sources from all over, especially from moms themselves.

I'm more consistent with [discipline] now. I can understand it more. Right now, it takes a lot for him to really get me mad. Just some of the things that I've gone through with his growing and learning. I wasn't able to understand him. Now coming to ECFE, I'm now able to understand him. Also, knowing mothers that have like the same aged child as me. Knowing that we are both going through the same thing basically, that helps.

Staff Assessment of Parent Change

Staff assessment of parent outcomes were based on a comparison of fall and spring parent interview scores. The analysis included an examination of score distributions for the study group as well as individual score change.

- **As a group, parent interview scores improved in all four concept areas. Most importantly, the percentage of parents receiving low scores declined. In the area of knowledge and awareness of own child, the percentage of parents receiving low scores declined 57 percent; parent self-assessment 30 percent; parent role perception 29 percent; and parent behavior 27 percent.**

Table 16 shows the distribution of both fall and spring scores for each concept area by skill level (high, medium and low). For all concept areas the percentage of parents receiving medium or high scores increased and the percentage receiving low scores decreased.

Table16: Distribution of Parents' Concept Area Scores (n=118)

	Fall Reported in Percent	**Spring** Reported in Percent
Low Scores:		
Knowledge/ Awareness of own child	39%	17%
Parent Self-Assessment	25%	18%
Parent Behavior	69%	50%
Parent Role Perception	61%	43%
Medium Scores:		
Knowledge/ Awareness of own child	52%	69%
Parent Self Assessment	71%	75%
Parent Behavior	30%	49%
Parent Role Perception	40%	54%
High Scores:		
Knowledge/ Awareness of own child	10%	15%
Parent Self-Assessment	4%	6%
Parent Behavior	1%	1%
Parent Role Perception	---	3%

Of particular interest is the decline in the percentage of parents receiving low scores. The percentage of parents receiving low scores at the end of the program year declined 57 percent for knowledge/awareness of own child, 30 percent for parent self-

assessment, 29 percent for parent role perception, and 27 percent for parent behavior. Table 17 shows percentage decrease in parents receiving low scores.

Table17: Percentage Decrease in Number of Parents Receiving Low Concept Area Scores.

Concept Area	Percentage Decrease in Number of Parents Receiving Low Scores
Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child	-57%
Parent Self Assessment	-30%
Parent Role Perception	-29%
Parent Behavior	-27%

- **An analysis of individual scores reveals that 25-34 percent of parents demonstrated positive score change in the concept areas. More parents demonstrated positive change in knowledge and awareness of their child (34 percent) than parent behavior (25 percent) or parent role perception (25 percent).**

Table 18 shows the percentage of parents whose scores demonstrated different change patterns. *Positive change* includes parents whose scores moved, in a positive direction, to the next skill level: from low to medium, low to high, or medium to high. *Stable acceptable scores* include parents whose scores stayed within the medium or high range. The *low end-of-program* group includes all parents receiving low spring scores. Between 22 and 34 percent of the parents demonstrated substantial positive score change in the four concept areas, and more parents improved scores in knowledge/awareness (34 percent) than in other areas.

Twenty-five percent of the parents demonstrated positive change in parenting behavior compared to 34 percent who demonstrated positive knowledge change. In addition, 50 percent maintained low end-of-program behavior ratings compared to only 17 percent of the parents who had low knowledge ratings. See Table18.

Table18: Percentage of Parents Demonstrating Different Score Change Patterns (n=118)

	Score Change Pattern			
	Positive Change*	Acceptable Stable Scores**	Low End-of-Program Scores***	Concept Area Total
Concept Area:				
Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child	34%	49%	17%	100%
Parent Role Perception	25%	32%	43%	100%
Parent Behavior	25%	25%	50%	100%
Parent Self-Assessment	22%	60%	18%	100%

* Percentage of parents whose scores moved from low to medium or medium to high.
**Percentage of parents whose scores stayed at an acceptable level (medium or high).
***Percentage of parents whose spring score was low.

Samples of Parent Responses Representing Change Patterns

Samples of parent responses representing positive change and low end-of-program scores are presented here for all four concept areas. These examples illustrate the important and often incremental and subtle change demonstrated by parents. It is important to note that change may not be illustrated by parents' responses to all questions in a concept area; change usually appears in response to some but not all questions.

The types of changes to look for in parent responses include responses reflecting age-appropriate understanding of the child; dropping or more limited use of terms that attribute inappropriate characteristics to the child and that may stigmatize a child over time; adoption of strategies or behaviors that support positive parent-child relationships; and statements that demonstrate reflection on the parent's behavior or purpose.

Samples of Positive Change--Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child

Mother of 2 1/2-year-old son.

Fall

Parent's description of child:
He is very active and likes to be independent. He picks on everybody, even if they are bigger than him. He has two older brothers, so he has to fend for himself. He has his own different personality. With his two older brothers they're kind of similar and play with cars and trucks, but he likes to be by himself, playing by himself, or beating some other kid, he likes to pick on other people.

Parent's description of what children are like at this age:
In trouble, in mischief. Want to be independent, tries to do things for himself. Very rebellious, active.

Parent's description of how her child learns:
He's talking more, saying more words. I think he is learning to distinguish between colors because when I was putting his shoes on and I put on white socks and he didn't like that, he wanted green. He doesn't want to take a nap anymore. I used to have no problem getting him to take a nap and but he's learning that if he takes a nap he can't play. He knows if the door goes shut he screams because he knows he can't go outside. He's just learning more, whining more, and wants to go outside, but it's so busy out here so he can't. He finding out the kids can beat him up. Because he was smaller than the other kids they would let him beat them up, but I told them no, that they should start to fight back and he has learned that he can't fight with other people.

Parent's discussion of child-only video segment:
[Son with bus on floor. Puts bus in the shopping cart and drives it. Stops and looks at camera, puts foot on cart wheel axle so cart tips up. Son gets the mop and dusts the top of the puppet stage. Seems to be trying to poke or reach something with mop. Son throws the mop up, telephone falls to the floor. Son takes mop and mops the floor and goes by the cameras.]

He started out playing with a car and then got out the shopping cart and started playing with that and then he was taking the mop after stuff. Trying to throw it up on to the shelf, later on he started to try hitting people. He can play independently by himself, he doesn't always need a mom around. It was cute watching him play by himself. Wish he would do that at home. He can have fun by himself and how grown up he is becoming. He is getting very independent. He is breaking away from mom.

Spring

Parent's description of child:
He's full of energy. He's got a real short temper on him. He's fun to be around. He likes to be a little bit of a bully. He likes to cuddle.

Parent's description of what children are like at this age:
He's full of energy. He's got a temper. They like to be independent but not too much. He'll do stuff by himself, but then he'll come back and check in to make sure I'm still there, then he'll go back and play on his own, or play with somebody else. He's talking more. He picks fights. He's into tattling on his two brothers or anybody else. That's about it.

Parent's description of how her child learns:
He's learning quicker, picks up on things more easy. He back-talks quite a bit. He's learning things faster now, by being at home and then by going to[ECFE] two days a week, he picks up things pretty fast. He's more willing to help at home.

Parent's discussion of child-only video segment:
Son puts on firehat. Girl gives him the telephone. Son goes over to Mom. She brings him back. Son gets baby and tries to put it in high chair. Son puts the baby in the high chair. Girl pushes son. He pushes back. Girl leaves crying.

First he was playing with the phone, then he came up to my table and ended up walking away from the table. Then I got him interested in playing with a dolly, him and another girl had gotten in a fight about her and one of the other parents stepped in and I would have liked to see them settle the fight themselves. Then I also noticed he's had a hard time getting the baby in the high chair and I told him to put the tray back down and put the baby in over the tray and he's listening better and I just had to tell him once to put the tray down and put the baby over the tray and he's listening better and that's probably the only thing I tell him the first time 'cause ordinarily it will take two or three times but that day he listened the first time and he's been listening better at home also.

He can play independently without me being around. I didn't have to get up and take him back in there after I got him interested in something else. He did play by himself and he must have worked for fifteen minutes to get that diaper back on the baby and he was trying and then he realized he couldn't do it and then he did ask for help to get the diaper back on the baby. He kept checking to make sure I was there and I was sitting off on our table and he checked to see if I was there and then he'd go back and play; just reinforced that I was there.

Samples of Positive Change--Parent Behavior

Mother of 3-year-old daughter.

Fall

Parent Self-Control: How parent handles her own frustrations.
I tell her to go in her room and leave me alone for awhile, and it works for about two minutes and then she's back out here again.

Sensitivity/Responsivity: How parent responds when child is frustrated or angry.
If she's having a fit or something, I tell her to go in her room because I don't want to see that kind of behavior. So I send her to her room basically. But, if she's going to cry and scream and stuff I don't feel that me or anybody else has to listen to it. And she goes to her room, throws her fit, comes back out and is happy. So, it lasts about two minutes.

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction.
[Child pretends she's making supper with play food.] *We're cooking. We were creating new things. I thought it was funny, but I thought she was really creative, and she learned a new word, soggy, I think.*

Child is at easel painting a picture, and she requests help from mom who tells her how it needs to be done.] *She's very independent, and she likes to paint. She's my little artist. I'm glad she's getting bigger and independent.*

Spring

Parent Self-Control: How parent handles her own frustrations.
I tell her I'm angry or else I'm upset or mad or whatever and I just want to be alone a little bit till I'm not mad anymore. She understands that now, I just need my time to get not mad anymore.

Sensitivity/Responsivity: How parent responds when child is frustrated or angry.
I ask her why, why she's angry or frustrated. And you know if it's somebody else that's making her angry, I ask what they did to make her angry. So she really comes in touch with exactly what it is, not just the whole, I ask her what feeling is that, is that a good feeling or a bad feeling. You know, I tell her it's ok to have all feelings cause they help you.

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction.
[Child and parent are playing bean bags. Parent shows child how to count the bags going into the basket. They count by numbers and child does alphabetical letters.] *Cooperation. She was following instructions and she was trying even though she didn't know how, she wasn't afraid to jump in there and say it anyhow. We work good together.* [Parent and child are playing basketball. Mom shows child how to "dribble". Child does it her own way. Mom gives child praise when she makes a basket.] *She was copying, she was trying to do what I was doing. She was following instructions.*

Samples of Positive Change--Parent Role Perception

Mother, 3-year-old daughter.

Fall

Parent's description of parenting role, purpose, and how role changes when child enters kindergarten:
Teacher, a friend. I got to be her friend. She's got to trust me. I'm trying to make her the best person I can. I mean I don't want her to be a brat. I want her to listen to adults, her authority, not adults in general because she doesn't have to listen to every adult. Some adults aren't right. But, ya know just, I mean to follow rules and to make sure she knows there's rules in life that you got to follow, hopefully.

[When she goes to kindergarten] I won't be needed so much. I mean at three she needs me right now. I'm all she's got ya know, as far as everything she does and everywhere she goes, and every part of her life. . .But once she starts going to school then she'll have her own life and that's her own independence will be coming in. So I'll be, I'll still be number one, but I'll be set aside for awhile.

Description of parent role in videotaped segment:
Sometimes I get confused and um, tired.

Spring

Parent's description of parenting role, purpose, and how role changes when child enters kindergarten:
Hard, time consuming, forever satisfying, very satisfying. I really love being her mom. Frustrating, enjoyable, all kinds of things. I'm trying to make her up to be the best person she can possibly be. I don't want her to grow up ignorant to the way the world is and the way life is. I don't want her to grow up disrespectful, so I try to teach her respect and love, courtesy and manners.

[When she gets goes to kindergarten] my job will become less time consuming because I have less time into it, but then she'll be going into the world so I don't know how my job will change. I'll have to find out as she finds out, you know. I can't predict the future. I don't know.

Description of parent role in videotaped segment:
Teaching her about interacting with people and ABC's and 1,2,3's and ah, sharing. She did a very good job of sharing and expressing herself and getting what she wants out so other people understand it. I guess I'm doing a pretty good job!

Samples of Positive Change--Parent Self-Assessment

Mother, 2-year-old son.

Fall

[Strengths] *I try to encourage [my children] to all be friends. And to try to settle things amongst themselves instead of always running to me.*

[Weaknesses] *I feel that sometimes I do lose my cool. You know, like with disciplining. It's hard, especially with the older two. Where they're constantly fighting. It's hard to put one in time out and one in the other corner, you know, but they still come out at each other. And just to try to get that under control. That's what I need to work on.*

Spring

[Strengths] *I try to have patience. I just try keeping them busy as much as I possibly can.*

[Weaknesses] *I lose my cool every now and then. I feel that I get like more frustrated or whatever when my house isn't clean. . .I know I'm not going to have an immaculate house but I need some order in here I guess.*

Samples of Low End-of-Program Score--Knowledge/Awareness of Own Child

Mother, 3-year-old son.

Fall

Parent's description of child:
My child is very active. When he was born everybody spoiled him rotten. I didn't get no discipline on him when he was a baby. Being a first mom, I didn't know how to do all that. So now he does whatever he wants to do. If I want to discipline him I have to yell to make him listen to me.

Parent's description of what children are like at this age:
Other three-year-olds I see act a little different than he does. He has a lot more energy in him. Other three-year-olds just play with the toys. He won't play with the toys. He'll play with trucks.

Parent's description of how her child learns:
I don't have no idea. I have no idea [how he learns]. Not right now, I don't know.

Spring

Parent's description of child:
He likes big trucks and ice cream and trains.

Parent's description of what children are like at this age:
[Other three year olds] are the same as [my son]

Parent's description of how her child learns:
He's more serious. [Mother's observation about how son learns.]

Samples of Low End-of-Program Score--Parent Behavior

Mother, 3-year-old son.

Fall

Parent Self-Control: How parent handles her own frustrations.
My patience is very, very small. He doesn't mind and I get very frustrated with that. He likes to edge me on, and I spank his butt.

Guidance: How parent gets child to mind her.
He don't [mind]. He don't mind his parents, but he'll mind other people.

Sensitivity/Responsivity: How parent responds when child is frustrated or angry.
He will hit. . .hit me, and I hit him back. He will pound on the wall. He will take his toys and hit his sister with them.

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction
[Mother and son counting on the floor and looking at books.]
He's doing what I do. But he doesn't stay with it very long. He used to do it better then. He doesn't do it so much now. [Mother and son fixing tea and serving it to people.]
He doesn't want to do what I want him to do. But that's a good thing. He wants to do what he wants to do. And he doesn't listen to me. Sometimes that's good and sometimes that's not.

Spring

Parent Self-Control: How parent handles her own frustrations.
I blame myself.

Guidance: How parent gets child to mind her.
I try to help him, show him.

Sensitivity/Responsivity: How parent responds when child is frustrated or angry.
I ignore him.

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction.
[Child shoving toys around. Son and mom naming colors.]
He's tough with his toys. Not all of them. His McDonald toys he breaks them. He memorizes the last color and says it for all of them. He knows all his colors; he's being silly.
[Son getting frustrated with colors, flipping around.]

I don't like that. He's getting mean. He got frustrated. I don't like his butt in the air. He's like that when I tell him a story too.

Mother, 19-month-old son.

Fall

Parent Self-Control: How parent handles her own frustrations.
I just take time off for myself.

Guidance: How parent gets child to mind her.
I don't think, he wouldn't do what you like him to do, but if you teach him, if you do it first, then he'd probably do it after you.

Sensitivity/Responsivity: How parent responds when child is frustrated or angry.
If he wants something and you don't give it to him, he would act out. I'll just let him act out until he stops. And he will stop by himself.

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction.
[Child playing with shape sorter, mom playing with pounding toy. Child puts shapes into shape sorter. Mom takes other toys, objects out of crate. Mom starts pounding on balls. Gives child mallet.]

We're just playing, having fun. He was enjoying himself. He was so cute. [I'm] happy to see him playing.

[Mom and child going to group time. Child sits on mom's lap.]

We're doing something in a group with other kids. He learned how to share things with other kids and they're singing together and all that stuff.

Spring

Parent Self-Control: How parent handles her own frustrations.
He has a really bad temper, you know the tantrums. And I just ignore it, he whines a lot, I mean he whines all day long, he just keeps going and going, I just ignore him, that's what I do.

Guidance: How parent gets child to mind her.
You can't. Sometimes I try to show him what to do. He won't listen to me.

Sensitivity/Responsivity: How parent responds when child is frustrated or angry.
I just calm him down. He likes Barney, he'll watch Barney tapes and if he's crying non stop I'll say let's go watch Barney, and he'll calm down and watch Barney.

Parent's discussion of videotaped parent-child interaction.
[Mom and child seated on floor. Mom picks up little house and moves it to the side. Child moves over to house, lifts top and puts little people in house.]

[We're] playing together and he's exploring toys. And he's trying to copy whatever I do.

[Child and another child sitting in rocking boat. Mom is sitting outside the boat next to child. Other child starts hitting object on bar of boat. Child gets out of boat, gets a pretend baby bottle, brings it back to boat and copies other child's behavior. He hits a finger and holds it out for mom to kiss. Child is smiling most of time.]

He's playing with a girl in a boat together. And he's just playing with other kids, enjoying himself. Before he would not play with other kids. Now he gets along with other kids and he plays around. And he talks with them and stuff now.

Samples of Low End-of-Program Score--Parent Role Perception

Parent, 2-year-old son.

Fall

Parent discussion of role, purpose, and how role will change when child goes to kindergarten:
[Parent role] *Not a very good one. I don't know.*
I need to control myself more instead of being so hostile. I don't know.

[Purpose] *(Long pause) . . .I try to read to him. . um. . .um. . .I try to understand him, try to. . .I don't know.*

[When child goes to kindergarten] *It'll be scary. I think, I don't know what to expect.*

Parent discussion of role parent played in video-taped parent-child segment.
(Long pause.) *I don't know.* (Long pause.)

Spring

Parent discussion of role, purpose, and how role will change when child goes to kindergarten:
[Parent role] *I think I could be a better parent if I tried.*

[Purpose] *I don't know. I don't know. . .it's hard to say. . .That he grows up to be a good kid and not a rebel. . .That's it.*

[When child goes to kindergarten] *I don't know. I haven't really thought about it.*

Parent discussion of role parent played in video-taped parent-child segment.
I don't know.

[Interviewer probe] Did you see anything that made you think of what you're doing as a parent to him?
Spending time with him. Reading to him. Being with him. Being there for him.

Samples of Low End-of-Program Score--Parent Self Assessment

Mother, 3 year old daughter.

Fall

Strengths:
I don't know what I do well. I think I teach her well. I don't know, it's hard to ya know say good things about yourself cause ya just really don't know.

Weaknesses:
I don't have patience as much as I'd like. She really tries my patience at times. More patience I think every parent wants.

Spring

Strengths:
Um, I don't know, I don't know what I do good as a parent, I just try to be the best I can, that's, I don't know, that's a hard question.

Weaknesses:
I don't have a lot of patience.

Independent Raters' Assessments of Parent Behavior Change

• Independent ratings of parents' behavior as demonstrated in videotaped interaction with their child showed a 27 percent decline in the number of parents rated two (a lower rating). For the total sample, 8 percent of parents showed improvement.

Table 19 shows parents' score distribution for fall and spring scores on the Parent Behavior Rating Scale. Overall, 8 percent of parents demonstrated improvement in behavior scores. By the second assessment, 73 percent of the parents were rated three or four compared to 65 percent in the fall. Slightly over a quarter were rated two (25 percent) or one (3 percent) compared to 36 percent in the fall.

Table 19: Parent Behavior Score Change--Independent Assessment (n=118)

Score Distribution:	*Fall* Percent of Parents	*Spring* Percent of Parents
(Highest) 5	---	---
4	12%	16%
(Moderate) 3	53%	57%
2	33%	25%
(Lowest) 1	3%	3%

Table 20 shows the percentage change within rating categories from fall to spring. What is most important is the number of parents rated 2 (low) declined 27 percent from fall to spring.

Table 20: Change Within Rating Categories Fall to Spring

Rating Category:		Change Within Category (Percent Change)
(Highest)	5	---
	4	+42%
(Moderate)	3	+6%
	2	-27%
(Lowest)	1	0

Both staff and outside raters assessed parent behavior although they used different instruments and different data sets. Correlations were run on change scores to determine the extent to which staff and independent assessments concurred. Correlations between change scores were moderately strong and significant at the .05 level (.2343, p=.018). This suggests that although staff and independent raters used different assessment strategies, they rated parents' behavior in similar ways. That is, parents who were scored higher by staff were also likely to be scored higher by independent raters. See Appendix 6, page 153, for a complete discussion.

Comment--Difference Between Knowledge And Behavior Change And Implications For Family-Focused Programs

In this evaluation more parents demonstrated positive change in knowledge and awareness of their own children than in their parenting behavior. This is a common finding in social science. Awareness and knowledge of what we ought to do does not guarantee that we'll change long-standing behaviors. Transferring what one knows into day-to-day practice is neither instantaneous nor guaranteed. Common examples of this phenomenon are slow public adoption of seat belts and the difficulty people have in changing health habits. Behavior change is often a long-term proposition requiring support, practice and reflection.

A recent research summary of family support program outcomes notes the tenacity of parent behavior and implications for program strategy.

> *"[O]ne of the premises of family support is that benefits for the children follow from changes in parent behavior and attitudes. Parents are encouraged by program staff to interact differently with their children, but changing any habit is difficult, and changing patterns of behavior forged over many years is even harder. (Halpern) As a result, even in the best parent-focused program, positive benefits may take some time to emerge. . .From the point of view of children in the family, all of these factors are problematic: children's development does not wait while the modest effects of a parent-focused program gradually emerge. It is therefore intuitively sensible that better results should come from programs that link child-focused activities to parent-focused activities because in those programs parents and children are changing simultaneously, in mutually reinforcing ways[emphasis added]."* (Gamby, et al, p.13)

Interesting findings about the long-term effects of parent education and family support programs are emerging as social scientists and policy makers grapple with juvenile crime issues. A recent review by Hirokayu Yoshikawa (1995) included studies in criminology, psychology and education. His purpose was to identify programs that demonstrated long-term effects on antisocial behavior or delinquency. He introduced his review by pointing out that although most crime prevention initiatives target late childhood or adolescence, the literature suggests early childhood programs can effectively, and efficiently, ameliorate the effects of early childhood risk factors associated with later criminal or delinquent behaviors.

Four of the 40 programs Yoshikawa reviewed combined early childhood education with family support programs. Evaluations of these four programs assessed long-term (more than five year post-program) effects on parent or teacher ratings of antisocial behavior or actual delinquency records. All four programs Yoshikawa identified demonstrated positive effects: *"Positive effects on [children's'] cognitive and/or verbal ability and parenting preceded long-term effects on delinquency and antisocial behavior."* (1995, p.63).

A long-standing and distinctive feature of Minnesota's ECFE programs is the emphasis on working with parents and children *together*. The primary ECFE class model combines parent-child interaction time, along with parent discussion and child-focused guided play and learning. Typically, a parent and child attend a two hour session each week, divided into parent-child interaction time and child-focused guided play and learning while parents engage in group discussions with family educators. This is the

basic model used in tandem with home visits or other specialized services, depending on family preferences. Parents may also choose, for example, to participate in services designed for families with specific concerns, such as single parents, teen parents, parents of children with disabilities, employed parents, and others.

Site evaluators' responses to the finding about difference in knowledge and behavior change showed they recognize the challenge involved in supporting behavior change. In discussing this finding staff focused on specific recommendations for program delivery and teaching (see page 84). Staff recommended that programs review how parent-child interaction time is used to enhance parent skill, understanding and reflection. In addition, staff recommended that programs use videotapes and modify the SRI to help parents understand and critically assess their own parenting behavior.

A second concern among staff was the importance of supporting the evolution of parent-child relationships over time. As children grow, enter school, and enter other critical stages, the relationship between parents and children must change to support positive child development. Staff felt continuing emphasis on parent-child interaction, with particular emphasis on the development of parent roles through preschool and elementary school, would enhance and strengthen positive effects achieved during early years.

What do we know about parents whose scores changed?

• Results of the regression analysis showed that neither demographic attributes, numbers of risk factors, nor hours of participation predicted whether a parents' knowledge or behavior scores changed. In other words, characteristics of parents we know something about (demographics, number of critical events, and hours of participation) account for very little of the variance in parent score change for either staff or independent ratings.

Staff and independent ratings of parent behavior were analyzed to determine what we could learn about parents whose scores changed or remained the same. This included examinating frequency distributions and cross tabs to identify interesting patterns and regression analysis. Stepwise multiple regression analysis assessed the extent to which variations in scores could be explained by parents' demographic characteristics, amount of participation in ECFE or risk. Variables included the following:

- highest level of education completed;
- length of time at present address;
- income;
- number of different community programs participated in;
- number of critical events (risk factors);
- number of people in the household;
- parents' age;
- employment status;
- have children under the age of two;
- marital status (dichotomized variables for: never married, married, divorced); and,
- total hours of exposure to ECFE program.

The results of the regression analysis showed that neither demographic attributes, number of critical events, nor hours of participation explain changes in parents' scores. In other words, characteristics of parents about which we know something account for very little of the variance in parent score change for either staff or independent ratings. See Appendix 6, page 153, for a description of the regression analysis.

Low-income families who come to ECFE are diverse. We know that families come to ECFE with different levels of accumulated risk, skills and abilities and participate in different ways for different amounts of time. We know that many families demonstrate positive knowledge and behavior change and families that come with moderate or high skills maintain those skills. We also know that families demonstrating

positive change are diverse. There are no obvious attributes to distinguish families who demonstrate positive change from those with low end-of-program scores.

Comment--If We Cannot Identify Families Who Benefit The Most From ECFE, What Are The Implications For ECFE Practice?

The above finding may imply a limitation of the evaluation: We didn't measure an attribute or characteristic which may exist that in fact predicts those who improve and those who demonstrate low knowledge or behavior. The finding of no difference by demographic subgroup, however, is not unique to this evaluation. A summary of studies focused on two-generation parent-child programs noted that in three out of five programs where results were available, no differences were found by demographic subgroups (St. Pierre, 1995). In other words, although parents demonstrated change, outcomes could not be predicted by demographic attributes of participants.

The finding may also suggest that low-income families exhibiting diverse characteristics are effectively served by ECFE. A variety of low-income families exhibiting low levels of knowledge or parenting behavior demonstrate positive change. In addition, families who come to ECFE with moderate or high skills continue to demonstrate moderate or high level knowledge and behavior. This suggests that ECFE's universal access approach is effective with many different low-income families.

ECFE's universal access approach builds on voluntary choice, individualized programs and services, and the collaborative nature of adult learning. Families choose to participate in ECFE; families come because they want to. In addition, although ECFE provides a common program delivery model, there are variations and enhancements depending on individual family needs and district characteristics. Families may choose to participate in groups or other specialized services focused on their particular needs. Finally, ECFE recognizes that parent-child development is supported not only by staff but by other parents with young children. Parents coming with low child development knowledge and/or low levels of parent behavior interact with parents exhibiting moderate or high skill levels. Parents not only hear from family educators about appropriate practices but interact with and learn from their peers--parents who demonstrate those skills.

• **Parents report making behavioral change more often than staff's systematic assessments indicate parent behavior change. Although 67 percent of the parents discussed changes they had made in their behavior, staff assessments identified only 25 percent of the parents as demonstrating behavior change.**

Staff assessed parent behavior change by comparing fall and spring ratings of interview responses to specific questions. Parent comments about behavior change were obtained in the spring. During the spring interview, parents were asked to describe their current behavior, then whether they had changed their behavior in any way. For example, parents were asked how they behave toward their child when their patience is limited (how they control themselves). After describing their current approach to self-control, they were asked about any changes they had made in managing their frustrations since coming to ECFE. Staff assessments of change were based on parents' descriptions of current practice, not on the parents' discussions of how their practice had changed.

Parent and staff assessments of change or no change in parent behavior were in agreement for 41 percent of the study parents. In general, many more parents reported change (67 percent) than was reflected in staff assessment of parent behavior change (25 percent). Table 20 compares parent and staff perspectives about parent behavior change.

Table 21: Comparison of Parents' and Staffs' Perspectives About Parent Behavior Change (n=118)

Behavior Change Reported/Assessed:	Parents Reporting Behavior Change * (percent)	Staff Perspective** on Percent of Parents Demonstrating Behavior Change
Changed Behavior	67%	25%
No Change	30%	---
Stable Acceptable Score	---	25%
End-Score-Low	---	50%
Uncertain	3%	---
Overlap* **	41	

* Parents reporting they made changes in child guidance strategies during spring interviews.

** Based on interview score change for behavior concept area.

***Percent agreement between staff and parent perspectives was calculated by comparing types of individual score change and parent responses to question about behavior change.

Comment--Staff Reaction To Differences In Parent And Staff Perspectives About Change

Staff assessed parent behavior change twice--formally, as reported earlier, and informally.

Immediately following the spring round of parent interviews, site evaluators were asked for their informal impressions of parent change based on their interactions with parents during the final round of interviews and observations. At that time, many site evaluators expressed concern that parents did not recognize important changes in their behavior--changes site evaluators had observed. Site evaluators' informal assessments of parent behavior change were more positive than the results of their systematic assessment of interview data.

Staff discussions about the differences in their own perspectives about parent change focused exclusively on practical implications for ECFE practice. (Specific recommendations begin on page 83.) Site evaluators felt ECFE family educators need to recognize the tenuous relationship between knowledge and behavior change and review how programs help parents actively observe, practice and reflect on their parenting behavior and parent-child relationships.

Another implication of this finding is that multiple sources of information are helpful. One type of assessment limits what we know about the dynamic interplay between families and programs. Listening to parents and their perspectives balances informal, day-to-day judgments as well as findings from formal systematic evaluations.

Part III: Recommendations-- Program Response to Evaluation Findings

Program staff reviewed evaluation findings and responded with the following recommendations.

Recommendations for Policy:

1. Continue Minnesota's commitment to universal access ECFE programs. There is no compelling evidence to support specific targeting of ECFE programs on families with specific characteristics. This evaluation found that families with different characteristics exhibiting low levels of knowledge or parenting behavior demonstrate positive change. In addition, families who come with moderate or high skills maintain those skills. ECFE's universal access approach builds on voluntary choice, individualized programs and services, and the collaborative nature of adult learning by connecting families with other families in their community.

2. Expand funding for ECFE so that more than 40 percent of the eligible population can be served. Currently, ECFE reaches 40 percent of the eligible population of families with children from birth through four years of age in Minnesota. Programs are doing all they can do with current resources including extensive collaboration with others providing services to families with young children in their communities. To reach more eligible families, particularly those that are low-income, additional resources are needed. Many families do not participate because they are experiencing complex and stressful family situations. Resources for more comprehensive services are of particular importance.

3. Universal access programs with guided parent-child interaction components are needed through elementary school to support the evolution of positive parent-child relationships. Continuing positive effects of early ECFE exposure are not guaranteed. Programs are needed to support positive parent-child relationships as children and parents evolve over time and respond to life's challenges and opportunities. Emerging research is showing that programs focusing on children's cognitive growth *and* parenting prevent later delinquency and antisocial behavior.

Recommendations for Programs:

1. Work on building meaningful relationships based on understanding and trust with every parent. The time, interest and attention focused on study families improved their involvement in ECFE as well as staff knowledge of families. In-depth staff understanding of families *and* parent participation supports children and parent change. Relationship building--between parents and children *and* staff and families--is the central premise of ECFE. *Reacting with interest*, as soon as possible, to each and every family is vital.

2. Recognize that change in knowledge does not guarantee change in behavior--review all educational methods and look for ways to help parents observe, practice, and reflect on parenting behavior and their parent-child relationships.

- Recognize that parents (as adults) learn in different ways and over different lengths of time--some learn quickly, some take more time. Explore ways to meet individualized adult learning styles.

- Consider how teaching strategies effect behavioral change as well as knowledge change.

- Explore how to use videotaping more effectively as a teaching tool for developing parent observation, reflection and questioning skills; parent self-awareness; and parent ability to set goals for themselves and their children.

- Explore uses of evaluation strategies for ongoing staff development and program evaluation *and* teaching.

- Review how staff think about, plan for and implement the parent-child interaction component.

- Include more practice of skills taught in parent education and parent-child interaction activities. Integrate content/knowledge, support, and skill building, not neglecting any component.

3. Recognize that informed judgments must be made about parents' knowledge and skills to implement effective programs. Effective programs--programs which make a significant difference in the relationships between parents and children--evolve from informed judgments about what families bring to programs and what should be done to encourage positive change. *Making informed judgments about families is different from and should not be confused with judgmental assumptions* about family characteristics, behaviors or attitudes. Informed judgments are driven by a commitment to achieve best practice decisions and require thorough understanding of families, child development and family research, and cultural sensitivity. Families who come to ECFE are diverse and lock-step approaches to programming are not effective. Informed judgments provide the rationale for flexible, adaptive programs which have the capacity of serving well many different families.

Programs should encourage staff discussion of the role judgments play in programming, make distinctions between informed judgments and judgmental assumptions, and understand how judgments are translated into effective work with families.

4. Continue building ongoing evaluation into all program efforts and providing staff evaluation experience. The results of both phase I and II of the Changing Times, Changing Families studies of ECFE show strong growth in evaluation skills and use of information by program staff involved. Similar types of involvement for other staff members can enhance the positive effects of using evaluation processes and data in program delivery.

New Evaluation Issues:

1. Learn more about short-term outcomes of low-income families of color participating in ECFE. Although specific efforts were made to involve families of color in the study, only 17.5 percent of the study families were families of color. This raises issues that need to be addressed about the involvement and retention of families of color in ECFE. As this issue is addressed, short-term outcomes for ethnically diverse low-income program participants can also be better assessed.

2. Study outcomes demonstrated by families participating more than one program year. Since the families involved in the study participated for only six to nine months, we need to learn about what kinds of outcomes are demonstrated when families remain involved in ECFE. Questions such as the following need to be addressed: Does more knowledge and behavior change occur after longer periods of participation? Does

continued involvement in ECFE help parents who demonstrate little change after six to ten months? How much involvement in ECFE is enough to support effective parenting? How effective is ECFE in supporting positive parent-child relationships as both parents and children develop and confront new life experiences?

3. Identify program practices and management strategies that support positive family change. As more is learned about changes families make in ECFE, districts and program sites can be identified that consistently support positive parent-child outcomes. These districts and programs can be studied to learn more about effective practices and management strategies.

Part IV: Reflections on Evaluation Process and Approach

This project combined two aims. The first represented a conventional use of program evaluation--to understand immediate program outcomes, make recommendations and share information about the evaluation results with others. The second was to support ECFE effectiveness by involving staff in the entire evaluation process, the assumption being that ECFE participants (Minnesota families) benefit from this approach. Program staff who have skills in thinking critically about information are in a better position to make optimal practice decisions.

The story of staff involvement in this evaluation is recorded in several places. The introduction describes ECFE's approach to evaluation (pages 20 to 22) and sheds light on how ECFE works with FERM to manage its evaluation agenda and meet its information needs. Specific duties performed by staff for this study are described on page 24. Staff reflections about evaluation findings are noted in comments throughout the document, and Part III includes their official reaction to this report in the form of specific recommendations.

The purpose of this final section is to record reflections and suggestions about the evaluation approach which are not discussed elsewhere.

Staffs' Reflections and Recommendations About the Evaluation Process and Approach

Following the final round of data collection, I surveyed all site evaluators to capture their conclusions about the process. I wanted their opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of staff participation in the study and their recommendations for staff involvement in future studies. I also wanted their opinions when they were literally exhausted from their work. Themes from their reflections are summarized below, along with some of their comments.

Advantages of staff involvement. Staff described several benefits of the study experience, including personal change, in-depth understanding of the families they serve, ideas for program change, better understanding of the evaluation process and information,

and the superior advantage staff have over outsiders in engaging families in the evaluation. In addition, some staff incorporated evaluation strategies as teaching strategies into their work with families.

Advantages of Staff Involvement--Sample of Staff Comments:

The experience is usable in working with families--not just detached information. The parent-staff bond was beyond the normal relationship; there was an amazing depth and trust. Affirms the staff competence and value to be part of a research/evaluation study.

I learned a lot about evaluation processes. I gained a greater appreciation for our own staff as I observed them during the taping as they interacted with families. I sharpened my own observation skills and experienced the power of observation as a learning tool to learn more about children and parent-child interaction.

All staff are aware and committed to the evaluation; not just myself. All year they wanted to "recruit" new participants and to help keep [study families] involved. Spring quarter I asked staff for help to cut down the number of nights I needed to videotape plus do home visits. We kept really "at risk" families involved and their connectedness to us was different than other families. Among them they had depression, suicide, multiple moves, at-risk pregnancies, separations, illness, etc., and still they hung in there.

It helped me look again at our goals; gained new ideas for staff in-services. Rewarding to be involved with families, to see how much they changed, to hear first hand about their stresses. Learned new strategies to use. We were on site to keep checking in with families throughout the year.

We gained skill in collection of data and observation/listening skills. We saw possibilities for use of the evaluation tools in our ongoing programming. We increased our awareness of boundary issues and objectivity. We gained status in the eyes of the community as we talked about the project with groups. We saw that parents enjoyed the process and the attention. We kept a sense of humor and grew in our respect for each other.

Heightened awareness of the importance of the process of evaluation. One family was in my class (studied by a colleague); it drove home to me the complexity/fragileness of some of our participants.

Learned huge amounts! Trainings were superb! Improved technical skills, observation skills; improved ability to look objectively at parenting qualities. Allowed staff and parents to connect in a new way; sometimes more intimate than in ordinary ECFE settings. Staff and parents benefited from this additional connection.

[Most important advantages were] what I learned about myself, about our program; about parents and children and how that information can be used to help participants.

Disadvantages of staff involvement. For the most part, staff comments reflected the complexity and demands of the evaluation. Many staff described the amount of time, energy, and organization that was required as important disadvantages. It was a challenge to complete evaluation duties while fulfilling their regular work with families. In addition, some staff felt district colleagues should have been more involved in the process. Some staff voiced concerns about the technical quality of their own contributions.

Disadvantages of Staff Involvement--Sample of Staff Comments:

We always underestimated how much time it would take. Clerical time was more extensive than we projected. The data collection times came at the busiest times of the year.

Some staff felt left out as some of us were in the thick of it; we were not able to be involved in "regular" work for a time. I think it created some resentment.

[Most important disadvantages] included the time commitment. The paid/unpaid time issue; there wouldn't be an ongoing budget to cover costs. Not all staff have a desk to call home; organization could be a problem. We needed information/help from other staff who didn't necessarily feel part of the process (just extra work to them).

It's a big commitment/expense to a program to involve staff in a project of this size, since class teaching load must be reduced to allow time for participation in the project.

Time commitment was overwhelming in fall; our program moved home to district, new space, new school, new staff, and I had a different role. It felt like a 2 ton load in the fall. Spring I got smarter and enlisted staff help and it was much easier.

Sometimes developing [parent-evaluator] relationship can be a disadvantage. Emotional attachments, parents become dependent. A sense of loss on both sides when process is over.

Other staff did not feel as much a part of study as I would have liked. It was hard to have respondent say they hadn't gained anything from ECFE and not jump up and down saying "yes, you did--you just said. . ."! Especially when you had the person in your class. Often respondent went on to say things after interview that were valuable.

Are we biased in our perceptions because we want to show more or increased benefits from ECFE???

Sometimes I felt inadequate and inaccurate. When talking with others I found that feeling to be common.

Actual analysis of the interviews can be tricky when you tend to want to give people the benefit of the doubt or remember the body language that went with responses that an evaluator from a more clinical background may be more literal with what's spoken. (This can also be an advantage.)

Lack of understanding of co-workers about benefits of process. Other staff members not interested or not understanding the method and its importance for ECFE. Also not understanding that the method is of use to the program locally.

[I have] less experience in interviewing so may miss opportunities to get parent answers clarified for fear of leading the parent on. May rush the process because I'm wearing too many hats.

Recommendations regarding staff involvement for future evaluations. Many site evaluators made general comments about the value of staff involvement and recommended continuing the approach in future evaluations. Staff also offered specific recommendations for easing the work load: for example, preparation of transcripts and involving more colleagues at the program site. Other staff suggestioned different ways to handle staff responsibilities for interview coding and analysis.

Recommendations for Future Evaluations--Examples of Staffs' Comments:

Our staff would be very willing to be involved with future evaluations. We probably learned more with having our own staff do it and pass it on to other staff members than having "outsiders" do it and then we would get information second hand.

I felt well-trained. Perhaps limits on the number of families per person to evaluate would relieve some of the pressure. Transcribing by a secretary is really important.

Ask for all staff help in fall instead of having one or two people assigned to it. We all learned to use a video camera this year!!

Pick extremely organized people to do this.

Perhaps use staff to only do data collection and have a totally different group of [staff] do the analysis.

"Just do it!" Benefits far outweigh any drawbacks.

Very important to program and participants to continue staff involvement.

Try doing analysis of fall and spring at same time setting to promote same frame of mind for analysis. This would be regardless if it was staff or others.

I believe staff involvement is important as information can be directly applied to teaching. I feel as though I will be more effective in integrating information because of the direct experience. When I've tried to explain this to other staff members I realize how difficult it is to apply the information gained because they've lacked some of the background information/experience.

Although very expensive, I would have more staff doing one or two participants. Would broaden the program "buy-in" and value to the larger picture. I would love to expand for use in video-taping staff for their own use/feedback/performance assessment.

It was helpful only doing 5 (study families) each. Would have been overwhelming doing more. Was good having another person at our site also participating to share some of the responsibility and to help each other out.

Author's Comments on Evaluation Strategies

The strategies used in this evaluation were developed or selected for their potential use in ECFE programs for teaching and staff development as well as for evaluation. Our experience in this project suggests some meet those dual purposes better than others.

Parent Interviews. Parent interviews serve both purposes well and are inherently flexible. The interview questions have been modified for use in following study families for a second year. The questions are also being used, with some changes, by Way To Grow programs. For staff and program development, interview information can be informally summarized. More systematic assessment of interview transcripts requires that staff think clearly about how they define skill levels (low, medium, high) as well as parenting concepts assumed under "understanding," "behavior," "parent role perception," etc. Staff discussion about skill levels and concepts relates directly to how they think about their work and objectives.

The series of questions about parent roles included on the parent interview and the SRI are fruitful and merit more work than we could accomplish in this project. How parents perceive and talk about their roles and how those roles change provides important insight about parent behavior.

Videotaped Observations and the SRI. Many site evaluators had limited videotaping experience before the study and most had concerns, as did I, about the effects of videotaping on parent responses. We discovered, however, that videotaping was effective at capturing observations, much less intrusive than we had expected, and powerful at helping parents reflect on their own behavior. Many programs plan to incorporate videotaping and SRI-type experiences into their regular work with families and a few have already done so.

During the pilot phase, all staff received general training using the equipment and conducting an observation. What's most important is that staff have the opportunity to become comfortable with the equipment in different settings.

Working with SRI information, which incorporates both audio and video data, requires an "A-V transcript"; relevant information from the videotape is needed so the audio transcript makes sense to the evaluator. Analyzing SRI transcripts, just like parent interview transcripts, benefits from staff discussion about skill level and concepts.

Parent Behavior Rating Scale. Staff reaction to the substance of the Parent Behavior Rating Scale (PBRS) was very positive. The scales addressed parent-child concepts that are embedded in the professional background and training of site evaluators.

I believe that the rating obtained from the scale is less useful for staff than the concepts described in the scale. The results of the factor analysis suggest that eight of the nine scales measure a common attribute--parent-child interaction. In other words, distinctions that can be made conceptually were not found empirically in this study.

Statistical significance of change findings. In reports of this kind questions are asked about the statistical significance of findings, particularly findings about change. Reporting statistical significance of change findings is most meaningful when studies are designed to test hypotheses, use random sampling strategies, and make comparisons among randomly selected groups.

The primary information users for this evaluation are program staff and the purpose of conducting the evaluation was to improve ECFE programs. Staff specified principles for the design and implementation of the evaluation (see page 22). These principles highlight the emphasis ECFE places on doing evaluation primarily for program improvement purposes and place clear parameters on design decisions. For example, data collection strategies were designed or selected based on their potential application in programs for educational as well as evaluation purposes and both study sites and evaluation participants were purposefully (rather than randomly) selected because they exhibited attributes and characteristics staff wanted to learn more about.

Designing the evaluation to test statistical significance would have required a research design that would not have been as useful to program staff and their questions even though it would have been useful to research and policy communities.

Appendix 1 : Response Patterns, New-to-ECFE Families, Fall 1994 and Spring 1995 Enrollment Surveys

Fall Enrollment Survey:	Total	Regional Fall Response		
	Total n(%)	Urban n	Suburban n	Rural n
All Respondents	711(100)	200	276	235
All Low-Income Respondents	409(58)	128	132	149
Study Families	150(37)	39	56	55
Spring Enrollment Survey:	**Total**	**Regional Spring Response**		
	n(response rate)*	Urban n(response rate)*	Suburban n(response rate)*	Rural n(response rate)*
All Respondents	401(56)	95(48)	157(57)	149(63)
All Low-Income Respondents	239(58)	63(49)	80(61)	96(64)
Study Families	118(79)	28(72)	44(79)	43(78)

*Percent of respondents completing both fall and spring surveys.

Appendix 2: Demographic Attributes, New-to-ECFE Families--1994 Fall Enrollment Survey Respondents

	All Respondents	Lower Income Respondents					
		All Lower Income Respondents	Non-Study Families	Study Families			
	Total n=711	Total n=409	Total n=259	Total n=150	City n=39	Suburban n=56	Rural n=55
Gender							
Male	59(8.4)	27(6.6)	24(9.3)	3(2.0)	1(2.6)	1(1.9)	1(1.8)
Female	647(91.6)	380(93.4)	235(90.7)	145(98.0)	38(97.4)	53(98.1)	54(98.2)
Marital Status							
Married	473(66.7)	210(51.5)	142(54.8)	68(45.6)	18(46.2)	25(45.5)	25(45.5)
Never married	155(21.9)	126(30.9)	68(26.3)	58(38.9)	17(43.6)	16(29.1)	25(45.5)
Divorced/separated	76(10.7)	69(16.9)	46(17.8)	23(15.4)	4(10.3)	14(25.5)	5(9.1)
Widowed	5(.7)	3(.7)	3(1.2)	---	---	---	---
Education							
8th grade or less	10(1.4)	10(2.5)	8(3.1)	2(1.4)	1(2.7)	1(1.8)	---
Some high school	80(11.3)	55(13.5)	35(13.5)	20(13.5)	5(13.5)	9(16.1)	6(10.9)
High school/GED	106(15.0)	81(19.9)	51(19.7)	30(20.3)	4(10.8)	8(14.3)	18(32.7)
Some college	288(40.7)	188(46.2)	113(43.6)	75(50.7)	18(48.6)	31(55.4)	26(47.3)
Bachelors Degree	153(21.6)	52(12.8)	39(15.1)	13(8.8)	6(16.2)	5(8.9)	2(3.6)
Graduate or Professional School	91(10.0)	21(5.2)	13(5.0)	8(5.4)	3(8.1)	2(3.6)	3(5.5)
Employment Status							
Unemployed/not seeking	291(41.5)	172(42.5)	99(38.4)	73(49.7)	20(52.6)	24(43.6)	29(53.7)
Unemployed/seeking	64(9.1)	52(12.8)	35(13.6)	17(11.6)	7(18.4)	2(3.6)	8(14.8)
Employed less than 25 hours/week	123(17.5)	69(17.0)	44(17.1)	25(17.0)	5(13.2)	11(20.0)	9(16.7)
Employed 25+ hours/week	224(31.9)	112(27.7)	80(31.0)	32(21.8)	6(15.8)	18(32.7)	8(14.8)
Age							
Less than 20 years	56(7.9)	35(8.6)	25(9.7)	10(6.7)	4(10.3)	3(5.4)	3(5.5)
20-29 years	310(43.7)	216(52.8)	121(46.7)	95(63.3)	22(56.4)	34(60.7)	39(70.9)
30-39 years	303(42.7)	144(35.2)	102(39.4)	42(28.0)	11(28.2)	18(32.1)	13(23.6)
40+ years	41(5.8)	14(3.4)	11(4.2)	3(2.0)	2(5.1)	1(1.8)	---

Appendix 2: Continued

	All Respondents	All Lower Income Respondents	Non-Study Families	Study Families			
	Total n=711	Total n=409	Total n=259	Total n=150	City n=39	Suburban n=56	Rural n=55
Children's Ages							
Birth to 5 months	133(19.1)	77(19.1)	48(19.0)	29(19.3)	5(12.8)	11(19.6)	13(23.6)
6-12 months	126(18.1)	62(15.4)	38(15.0)	24(16.0)	11(28.2)	8(14.3)	5(9.1)
13-23 months	175(25.1)	101(25.1)	52(20.6)	49(32.7)	10(25.6)	21(37.5)	18(32.7)
2 years	213(30.6)	126(31.3)	72(28.5)	54(36.0)	14(35.9)	20(35.7)	20(36.4)
3 years	143(20.5)	91(22.6)	61(24.1)	30(20.0)	6(15.4)	11(19.6)	13(23.6)
4 years	109(15.6)	82(20.3)	58(22.9)	24(16.0)	5(12.8)	8(14.3)	11(20.0)
5 years	62(8.9)	42(10.4)	31(12.3)	11(9.3)	3(7.7)	4(7.1)	4(7.3)
6-12 years	122(17.5)	83(20.6)	62(24.5)	21(14.0)	3(7.7)	14(25.0)	4(7.3)
13 years and up	31(4.4)	18(4.5)	11(4.3)	7(4.7)	3(7.7)	2(3.6)	2(3.6)
Number in Household							
1	4(.6)	4(1.0)	4(1.6)	---	---	---	---
2	64(9.1)	57(14.0)	32(12.4)	25(16.8)	11(28.2)	8(14.3)	6(11.1)
3	288(40.8)	140(34.4)	93(36.0)	47(31.5)	12(30.8)	13(23.2)	22(40.7)
4	216(30.6)	115(28.3)	67(26.0)	48(32.2)	8(20.5)	20(35.7)	20(37.0)
5	84(11.9)	53(13.0)	38(14.7)	15(10.1)	4(10.3)	7(12.5)	4(7.4)
6	31(4.4)	22(5.4)	16(6.2)	6(4.0)	1(2.6)	4(7.1)	1(1.9)
7	12(1.7)	9(2.2)	3(1.2)	6(4.0)	2(5.1)	3(5.4)	1(1.9)
8	7(1.0)	7(1.7)	5(1.9)	2(1.3)	1(2.6)	1(1.8)	---
Income							
$0 - $9,999	135(20.3)	135(33.0)	77(27.7)	58(38.7)	18(46.2)	18(32.1)	22(40.0)
$10,000 - $19,999	112(16.8)	112(27.4)	62(23.9)	50(33.3)	11(28.2)	19(33.9)	20(36.4)
$20,000 - $29,999	162(24.4)	162(39.6)	120(46.3)	42(28.0)	10(25.6)	19(33.9)	13(23.6)
$30,000 - $39,999	86(12.9)	---	---	---	---	---	---
$40,000 - $49,999	109(16.4)	---	---	---	---	---	---
$50,000+	61(9.2)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Ethnicity							
White (non-Hispanic)	592(86.3)	317(81.1)	199(80.2)	118(82.5)	24(66.7)	49(92.5)	45(83.3)
African American	42(6.1)	32(8.2)	26(10.5)	6(4.2)	4(11.1)	2(3.8)	---
Hispanic	9(1.3)	8(2.0)	4(1.6)	4(2.8)	2(5.6)	---	2(3.7)
Asian Pacific Islander	27(3.9)	21(5.4)	13(5.2)	8(5.6)	3(8.3)	1(1.9)	4(7.4)
American Indian	16(2.3)	13(3.3)	6(2.4)	7(4.9)	3(8.3)	1(1.9)	3(5.6)

Appendix 2: Continued

	All Respondents	All Lower Income Respondents	Non-Study Families	Study Families			
	Total n=711	Total n=409	Total n=259	Total n=150	City n=39	Suburban n=56	Rural n=55
Residency-Neighborhood							
Less than 1 year	178(25.2)	132(32.6)	82(32.2)	50(33.3)	13(33.3)	25(44.6)	12(21.8)
1-3 years	200(28.3)	122(30.1)	70(27.5)	52(34.7)	11(28.2)	17(30.4)	24(43.6)
4-5 years	84(11.9)	32(7.9)	21(8.2)	11(7.3)	4(10.3)	2(3.6)	5(9.1)
5+ years	244(34.6)	119(29.4)	82(32.2)	37(24.7)	11(28.2)	12(21.4)	14(25.5)
Residency-current address							
Less than 1 year	261(37.3)	199(49.5)	121(47.5)	78(53.1)	23(62.2)	29(51.8)	26(48.1)
1-3 years	225(32.1)	121(30.1)	70(27.5)	51(34.7)	8(21.6)	23(41.1)	20(37.0)
4-5 years	90(12.9)	32(8.0)	25(9.8)	7(4.8)	3(8.1)	2(3.6)	2(3.7)
5+ years	124(17.7)	50(12.4)	39(15.3)	11(7.5)	3(8.1)	2(3.6)	6(11.1)
Concerns							
Caring for or raising your children.	324(57.8)	182(52.9)	112(52.8)	70(53.0)	23(62.2)	26(54.2)	21(44.7)
Your own health and well-being.	192(43.2)	116(33.7)	73(34.4)	43(32.6)	14(37.8)	19(39.6)	10(21.3)
Making ends meet.	308(54.9)	229(66.6)	139(65.6)	90(68.2)	24(64.9)	36(75.0)	30(63.8)
Feeling lonely.	226(40.3)	152(44.2)	88(41.5)	64(48.5)	19(51.4)	25(52.1)	20(42.6)
Making contact with schools or teachers.	100(17.8)	71(20.6)	41(19.3)	30(22.7)	13(35.1)	7(14.6)	10(21.3)
Understanding how your job as a parent changes as your child grows.	283(50.4)	149(43.3)	89(42.0)	60(45.5)	21(56.8)	23(47.9)	16(34.0)
Providing food and clothing for your children.	120(21.4)	99(28.8)	60(28.3)	39(29.5)	12(32.4)	14(29.2)	13(27.7)

Appendix 2: Continued

	All Respondents	All Lower Income Respondents	Non-Study Families	Study Families			
	Total n=711	Total n=409	Total n=259	Total n=150	City n=39	Suburban n=56	Rural n=55
Number of Different Concerns							
0	150(21.1)	65(15.9)	47(18.1)	18(12.0)	2(5.1)	8(14.3)	8(14.3)
1	133(18.7)	72(17.6)	47(18.1)	25(16.7)	7(17.9)	8(14.3)	10(18.2)
2	147(20.7)	87(21.3)	51(19.7)	36(24.0)	8(20.5)	12(21.4)	16(29.1)
3	126(17.7)	78(19.1)	52(20.1)	26(17.3)	6(15.4)	7(12.5)	13(23.6)
4	71(10.0)	50(12.2)	31(12.0)	19(12.7)	4(10.3)	12(21.4)	3(5.5)
5	52(7.3)	33(8.1)	19(7.3)	14(9.3)	6(15.4)	5(8.9)	3(5.5)
6	20(2.8)	15(3.7)	6(2.3)	9(6.0)	3(7.7)	4(7.1)	2(3.6)
7	12(1.7)	9(2.2)	6(2.3)	3(2.0)	3(7.7)	---	---
Critical Events							
Income decreased substantially.	244(35.2)	169(42.0)	107(42.1)	62(41.9)	11(28.2)	20(36.4)	31(57.4)
Death of immediate family member.	86(12.4)	50(12.5)	34(13.5)	16(10.7)	2(5.1)	6(10.7)	8(14.8)
Chronic illness or disability.	89(12.8)	48(12.1)	34(13.7)	14(9.4)	5(12.8)	5(8.9)	4(7.4)
Moved to a new location.	273(39.1)	202(50.0)	122(47.8)	80(53.7)	22(56.4)	32(57.1)	26(48.1)
Home destroyed.	11(1.6)	9(2.3)	8(3.2)	1(.7)	1(2.6)	---	---
Alcohol or drug problem.	42(6.1)	34(8.5)	23(9.2)	11(7.4)	2(5.1)	7(12.5)	2(3.7)
Serious money problems.	167(24.0)	143(35.7)	83(32.8)	60(40.5)	14(35.9)	22(40.0)	24(44.4)
Divorce.	48(6.9)	40(10.0)	31(12.4)	9(6.0)	2(5.1)	5(8.9)	2(3.7)
Separation from spouse or partner.	113(16.3)	94(23.5)	60(23.8)	34(23.0)	10(25.6)	16(28.6)	8(15.1)
Entered new school.	162(23.3)	120(29.9)	71(28.2)	49(32.9)	9(23.1)	24(42.9)	16(29.6)
Pregnancy.	226(32.4)	113(28.2)	74(29.5)	39(26.0)	13(33.3)	11(19.6)	15(27.3)
Birth of youngest child.	204(29.4)	108(27.1)	266(26.5)	42(28.0)	13(33.3)	13(23.2)	16(29.1)
Trouble providing children with clothing or shoes.	68(9.8)	62(15.5)	41(16.3)	21(14.1)	7(17.9)	8(14.3)	6(11.1)
Death of parent.	33(4.7)	20(5.0)	13(5.2)	7(4.7)	4(10.3)	1(1.8)	2(3.7)
Trouble with teachers at school.	20(2.9)	15(3.8)	10(4.0)	5(3.4)	2(5.1)	1(1.8)	2(3.7)

Appendix 2. : Continued

	All Respondents	All Lower Income Respondents	Non-Study Families	Study Families			
	Total n=711	Total n=409	Total n=259	Total n=150	City n=39	Suburban n=56	Rural n=55
Number of Different Events							
0	125(17.6)	55(13.4)	40(15.4)	15(10.0)	5(12.8)	4(7.1)	6(10.9)
1	133(18.7)	61(14.9)	31(12.0)	30(20.0)	9(23.1)	10(17.9)	11(20.0)
2	140(19.7)	70(17.1)	49(18.9)	21(14.0)	2(5.1)	11(19.6)	8(14.5)
3	120(16.9)	76(18.6)	49(18.9)	27(18.0)	7(17.9)	11(19.6)	9(16.4)
4	71(10.0)	46(11.2)	25(9.7)	21(14.0)	6(15.4)	7(12.5)	8(14.5)
5	54(7.6)	43(10.5)	28(10.8)	15(10.0)	4(10.3)	5(8.9)	6(10.9)
6	39(5.5)	29(7.1)	17(6.6)	12(8.0)	4(10.3)	5(8.9)	3(5.5)
7	17(2.4)	17(4.2)	11(4.2)	6(4.0)	1(2.6)	1(1.8)	4(7.3)
8	8(1.1)	8(2.0)	5(1.9)	3(2.0)	1(2.6)	2(3.6)	---
9	3(.4)	3(.7)	3(1.2)	---	---	---	---
10	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
11	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
12	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
13	1(.1)	1(.2)	1(.4)	---	---	---	---

Appendix 3: Chi Square Results--Study Families Compared to Other Lower-Income Respondents to the 1994 ECFE Fall Enrollment Survey

	No-Study Lower-Income Respondents	Study Family Respondents	Chi Square Results		
	n=259	n=150	Significance *p< .05	X Statistic	Df
Gender			*	7.9	1
Male	24(9.3)	3(2.0)			
Female	235(90.7)	145(98.0)			
Marital Status			*	8.4	3
Married	142(54.8)	68(45.6)			
Never married	68(26.3)	58(38.9)			
Divorced/separated	46(17.8)	23(15.4)			
Widowed	3(1.2)	---			
Education			---		
8th grade or less	8(3.1)	2(1.4)			
Some high school	35(13.5)	20(13.5)			
High school/GED	51(19.7)	30(20.3)			
Some college	133(43.6)	75(50.7)			
Bachelors Degree	39(15.1)	13(8.8)			
Graduate or Professional School	13(5.0)	8(5.4)			
Employment Status			---		
Unemployed/not seeking	99(38.4)	73(49.7)			
Unemployed/seeking	35(13.6)	17(11.6)			
Employed less than 25 hours/week	44(17.1)	25(17.0)			
Employed 25+ hours/week	80(31.0)	32(21.8)			
Age			*	10.8	3
Less than 20 years	25(9.7)	10(6.7)			
20-29 years	121(46.7)	95(63.3)			
30-39 years	102(39.4)	42(28.0)			
40+ years	11(4.2)	3(2.0)			
Number in Household			---		
1	4(1.6)	---			
2	32(12.4)	25(18.6)			
3	93(36.0)	47(31.5)			
4	67(26.0)	48(32.2)			
5	38(14.7)	15(10.1)			
6	16(6.2)	6(4.0)			
7	3(1.2)	6(4.0)			
8	5(1.9)	2(1.3)			

	No-Study Lower-Income Respondents	Study Family Respondents	Chi Square Results		
	n=259	n=150	*p< .05	X	Df
Income			*	13.4	2
$0 - $9,999	77(27.7)	58(38.7)			
$10,000 - $19,999	62(23.9)	50(33.3)			
$20,000 - $29,999	120(46.3)	42(28.0)			
$30,000 - $39,999	---	---			
$40,000 - $49,999	---	---			
$50,000+	---	---			
Ethnicity			---		
White (non-Hispanic)	199(80.2)	118(82.5)			
African American	26(10.5)	6(4.2)			
Hispanic	4(1.6)	4(2.8)			
Asian Pacific Islander	13(5.2)	8(5.6)			
American Indian	6(2.4)	7(4.9)			
Residency-Neighborhood			---		
Less than 1 year	82(32.2)	50(33.3)			
1-3 years	70(27.5)	52(34.7)			
4-5 years	21(8.2)	11(7.3)			
5+ years	82(32.2)	37(24.7)			
Residency-address			*	9.7	3
Less than 1 year	121(47.5)	78(53.1)			
1-3 years	70(27.5)	51(34.7)			
4-5 years	25(9.8)	7(4.8)			
5+ years	39(15.3)	11(7.5)			
Concerns			---		
Caring for or raising your children.	112(52.8)	70(53.0)			
Own health/well-being.	73(34.4)	43(32.6)			
Making ends meet.	139(65.6)	90(68.2)			
Feeling lonely.	88(41.5)	64(48.5)			
Making contact with schools or teachers.	41(19.3)	30(22.7)			
Understanding how job as parent changes as your child grows.	89(42.0)	60(45.5)			
Providing food/clothes for your children.	60(28.3)	39(29.5)			
Number of Different Concerns			---		
0	47(18.1)	18(12.0)			
1	47(18.1)	25(16.7)			
2	51(19.7)	36(24.0)			
3	52(20.1)	26(17.3)			
4	31(12.0)	19(12.7)			
5	19(7.3)	14(9.3)			
6	6(2.3)	9(6.0)			
7	6(2.3)	3(2.0)			

	Non-Study Lower-Income Respondents	Study Family Respondents	Chi Square Results		
	n=259	n=150	Significance *$p < .05$	X Statistic	Df
Critical Events			---		
Income decreased substantially.	107(42.1)	62(41.9)			
Death of immediate family member.	34(13.5)	16(10.7)			
Chronic illness or disability.	34(13.7)	14(9.4)			
Moved to a new location.	122(47.8)	80(53.7)			
Home destroyed.	8(3.2)	1(.7)			
Alcohol or drug problem.	23(9.2)	11(7.4)			
Serious money problems.	83(32.8)	60(40.5)			
Divorce.	31(12.4)	9(6.0)			
Separation from spouse or partner.	60(23.8)	34(23.0)			
Entered new school.	71(28.2)	49(32.9			
Pregnancy.	74(29.5)	39(26.0)			
Birth of youngest child.	?66(26.5)	42(28.0)			
Trouble providing children with clothing or shoes.	41(16.3)	21(14.1)			
Death of parent.	13(5.2)	7(4.7)			
Trouble with teachers at school.	10(4.0)	5(3.4)			
Number of Different Events			---		
0	40(15.4)	15(10.0)			
1	31(12.0)	30(20.0)			
2	49(18.9)	21(14.0)			
3	49(18.9)	27(18.0)			
4	25(9.7)	21(14.0)			
5	28(10.8)	15(10.0)			
6	17(6.6)	12(8.0)			
7	11(4.2)	6(4.0)			
8	5(1.9)	3(2.0)			
9	3(1.2)	---			
10	---	---			
11	---	---			
12	---	---			
13	1(.4)	---			

Appendix 4.1: Fall Enrollment Survey

1994 Fall Enrollment Survey

Welcome to Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE). We're looking forward to getting to know you and your child. ECFE is a program of information and support for parents with a child from birth to kindergarten. In addition, ECFE provides your child the chance to be with other children their age.

An enrollment survey is attached to this note. We're asking each new family to fill out the survey.

This year we are a part of a very large study focusing on families who are not high income and who are new to ECFE. We study our programs routinely and the purpose of this study is to help us understand what parents and children gain from being in the program.

The information you provide is confidential. Your responses will be combined with information from other families. Findings from this survey will be reported in such a manner that no single individual will be identified. We're asking for your name so we can contact you next spring to fill out an end-of-program survey. Also, some families selected to participate in interviews and observations.

If you do not wish to respond to a question, just skip it and go on to the next question. If you have any questions, feel free to ask any staff member to help you.

For further information about the study contact your local ECFE program or Betty Cooke, ECFE Specialist, Minnesota Department of Education, (612) 296-6130.

Thank you for helping us with this special study.

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

I.D.#_____

1994 Enrollment Survey

[Q1] Parent's Name (Your Name)_____

Address _____

_____

Phone Number_____

[Q2] Names of children participating with you in Early Childhood Family Education:

	Name	*Sex*	*Birthdate*
a.			
b.			
c.			

[Q3] Please list names, sex, and birth-dates of other children in your household.

	Name	*Sex*	*Birthdate*
a.			
b.			
c.			

[Q4] Is there someone who shares day-to-day parenting duties with you; someone who regularly helps you supervise and care for your child(ren)? (Please check response.)

a.____No

b.____Yes ⇒ if yes, *Who* is it? (check one response)

b1.___your spouse/partner
b2.___your mother
b3.___your father
b4.___your sister
b5.___child's other parent
b6.____your brother
b7.____other relatives
b8.____friend
b9.____neighbor
b10.___someone else

[Q5] In the past 6 months, have you had concerns about any of the following? (please check all those that apply)

a.____Caring for or raising your children.
b.____Your own health and well-being.
c.____Making ends meet.
d.____Feeling lonely.
e.____Making contact with schools or teachers.
f.____Understanding how your job as a parent changes as your child grows.
g.____Providing food and clothing for your children?

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

[Q6]. Please circle the number which you feel best describes your situation.

HOW OFTEN. . .	**Never**	**Less than once a month**	**1-2 times a month**	**Once a week or more.**
a. do you *give* help to friends, neighbors, or relatives with:				
a1. baby sitting?	1	2	3	4
a2. transportation?	1	2	3	4
a3. help in emergencies?	1	2	3	4
a4. meals or food	1	2	3	4
a5. providing clothes, furniture, toys?	1	2	3	4
a6. advice about child rearing?	1	2	3	4
a7. regular child care?	1	2	3	4
b. do you *receive* help from friends, neighbors, or relatives with:				
b1. baby sitting?	1	2	3	4
b2. transportation?	1	2	3	4
b3. help in emergencies?	1	2	3	4
b4. meals or food	1	2	3	4
b5. providing clothes, furniture, toys?	1	2	3	4
b6. advice about child rearing?	1	2	3	4
b7. regular child care?	1	2	3	4

TO WHAT EXTENT. . .	**Never**	**Less than once a month**	**1-2 times a month**	**Once a week or more.**
c. do you talk to friends or relatives about new or interesting things your child is doing?	1	2	3	4
d. do you talk to friends or relatives when you have a problem or concern about parenting or child rearing?	1	2	3	4
e. do you spend time doing things together as a family?	1	2	3	4
f. do you talk to someone about your own interests, ideas, or future?	1	2	3	4
g. do you talk to someone about personal problems or concerns?	1	2	3	4
h. do you spend time on your own enjoyment or recreation (hobbies, sports, going to movies, parties, etc)?	1	2	3	4
i. are you involved in work, school, and/or community activities?	1	2	3	4
j. do you spend time with other parents with young children (other than coming to ECFE)?	1	2	3	4

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

[Q7] Circle the response which best describes how satisfied you are with the following.

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU...	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
a. with the advice you get from friends or relatives about parenting/child rearing concerns that you have?	1	2	3	4	
b. with the help you get supervising and caring for your children?	1	2	3	4	
c. with the advice you get from others about personal problems or concerns?	1	2	3	4	
d. with the amount of time you get to spend on your own enjoyment or recreation?	1	2	3	4	
e. with the amount of contact you have with other parents with young children?	1	2	3	4	
f. with the way things are going for you and your family?	1	2	3	4	
g. with the way family members in your household get along together.	1	2	3	4	
h. with your current employment status?	1	2	3	4	Not employed/ not seeking employment

[Q8] Which of the following events, if any, occured in your immediate family during the past 12 months? (Circle the response which best fits your situation.)

	YES	NO
a. Income decreased substantially.	1	2
b. Death of immediate family member.	1	2
c. Chronic illness or disability.	1	2
d. Moved to a new location.	1	2
e. Home destroyed by fire, flood, tornado, etc.	1	2
f. Alcohol or drug problem.	1	2
g. Serious money problems.	1	2
h. Divorce.	1	2
i. Separation from a spouse or partner.	1	2
j. Entered new school.	1	2
k. Pregnancy.	1	2
l. Trouble with teachers at school.	1	2
m. Birth of youngest child.	1	2
n. Trouble providing children with clothing or shoes.	1	2
o. Death of parent.	1	2

[Q9] How long have you participated in ECFE? (check one)

a._____Less than 3 months
b._____3 months to 1 year
c._____1 year to 2 years
d._____More than 2 years

[Q10] Your sex:(check one)

a._____Male
b._____Female

[Q11] Your age: (check one)

a._____Less than 20 years old
b._____20-29 years old
c._____30-39 years old
d._____40 years old or older

[Q12] Your current marital status: (check one)

a._____Never Married
b._____Married
c._____Widowed
d._____Divorced or Separated

[Q13] Check highest education level you completed: (check one)

a._____8th grade or less
b._____Some high school
c._____High school diploma / GED
d._____Some college or trade school beyond high school.
e._____Bachelor's Degree
f._____Graduate or professional school degree

[Q14] Your current paid employment status (check one)

a._____Unemployed, not seeking employment (includes full-time homemaker or student)
b._____Unemployed, seeking employment
c._____Employed less than 25 hours per week
d._____Employed 25 hours or more per week

[Q15] What is your child (ren's) age(s)? (Check all that apply)

a._____Birth to 5 months
b._____6 to 12 months
c._____13 to 23 months
d._____2 years
e._____3 years
f._____4 years
g._____5 years
h._____6 to 12 years
i._____13 years and up

[Q16] What is the total number of people living in your household? (check one)

a._____1
b._____2
c._____3
d._____4
e._____5
f._____6
g._____7
h._____8 or more

[Q17] What is your household's total yearly income, before taxes ? (check one)

a._____$0 to $9,999
b._____$10,000 to $19,999
c._____$20,000 to $29,999
c._____$30,000 to $39,999
d._____$40,000 to $49,999
e._____$50,000 or more

[Q18] What is your racial/ethnic background? (check one)

a._____White, Non-Hispanic
b._____Black, Non-Hispanic
c._____Hispanic
d._____Asian/ Pacific Islander
e._____American Indian/ Alaskan Native

[Q19] What is the racial/ethnic background of your family members? (check **all** that apply)

a._____White, Non-Hispanic
b._____Black, Non-Hispanic
c._____Hispanic
d._____Asian/ Pacific Islander
e._____American Indian/ Alaskan Native

[Q20] How long have you lived in this community/neighborhood? (check one)

a._____Less than 1 year
b._____1 to 3 years
c._____4 to 5 years
d._____Over 5 years

[Q21] How long have you lived at your present address? (check one)

a._____Less than 1 year
b._____1 to 3 years
c._____4 to 5 years
d._____Over 5 years

[Q22] Please check all programs in which you and/or members of your household participate. (check all that apply)

a._____Head Start
b._____Medical Assistance
c._____WIC Nutrition Program
d._____Food Stamps
e._____AFDC
f._____Free/Reduced Price School Lunch
g._____Family Day Care
h._____Child Care Center
i._____Nursery School
j._____Adult Basic Education
k._____Family Literacy
l._____Learning Readiness
m._____Way to Grow
n._____Family Resource Center
o._____Special Education

Thank you for helping us with our study. We appreciate your help. Please return the survey to the person that gave it to you.

Appendix 4.2: Spring Enrollment Survey

1995 Spring Enrollment Survey

We've enjoyed getting to know you and your child. We hope that your first year in Early Childhood Family Education has been fun and rewarding for your family.

An enrollment survey is attached to this note. We're asking each first year family to fill out the survey. This survey is similar to the survey you completed last fall.

This year we are a part of a very large study focusing on families who are not high income and who are new to ECFE. We study our programs routinely and the purpose of this study is to help us understand what parents and children gain from being in the program.

The information you provide is confidential. Your responses will be combined with information from other families. Findings from this survey will be reported in such a manner that no single individual will be identified. We're asking for your name so we can check our response rates.

If you do not wish to respond to a question, just skip it and go on to the next question. If you have any questions, feel free to ask any staff member to help you.

For further information about the study contact your local ECFE program or Betty Cooke, ECFE Specialist, Minnesota Department of Education, (612) 296-6130.

Thank you for helping us with this special study.

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

I.D.#_____

1995 Spring Enrollment Survey

[Q1] Parent's Name (Your Name)_____

Address _____

_____

Phone Number_____

[Q2] How long have you participated in ECFE? (Please check one)

a._____Less than 3 months
b._____3 months to 1 year
c._____1 year to 2 years
d._____More than 2 years

[Q3] How would you describe your involvement in ECFE this year? (Please check the response which you feel best describes your involvement.)

a._____Inactive
b._____Somewhat inactive
c._____Somewhat active
d._____Very active

[Q4] Please circle the number which you feel best describes your situation.

TO WHAT EXTENT . . .	**Not at all**	**Not too much**	**Some-what**	**A Great Deal**
a. did you find ECFE a worthwhile experience for you and your child?	1	2	3	4
b. did the program cover topics and issues most important to you and your family?	1	2	3	4
c. did parent educators and children's teachers respond to your questions and concerns?	1	2	3	4
d. did parent educators and children's teachers treat you with respect?	1	2	3	4
e. did you meet other parents who have concerns and interests similar to your own?	1	2	3	4
f. do you feel your knowledge and understanding of child development has increased since last fall?	1	2	3	4
g. do you feel your confidence as a parent has increased since last fall?	1	2	3	4

[Q5] Since coming to ECFE, the way I relate to my child has changed in the following ways: (Please check all that apply to you.)

a.____I relate to my child pretty much the same way I did last fall.
b.____I stop to observe, listen and think before acting with my child.
c.____I am more in tune to and sensitive to my child's point of view.
d.____I spend more time with my child and have new ideas of activities to do with my child.
e.____Other: (describe)

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

[Q6] Since coming to ECFE, I've observed the following changes in my child: (Check all that apply to you.)

a.____My child seems pretty much the same now as she/he was last fall.
b.____My child seems more independent.
c.____My child has more self confidence.
d.____My child's language development and communication skills have improved.
e.____My child gets along better with other children.
f.____My child gets along better with other adults.
g.____Other: (describe)

[Q7] <u>At this time</u>, do you have concerns about any of the following? (please check all those that apply)

a.____Caring for or raising your children.
b.____Your own health and well-being.
c.____Making ends meet.
d.____Feeling lonely.
e.____Making contact with schools or teachers.
f.____Understanding how your job as a parent changes as your child grows.
g.____Providing food and clothing for your children?

[Q8] Is there someone who shares day-to-day parenting duties with you; someone who regularly helps you supervise and care for your child(ren)? (Please check response.)

a.____No
b.____Yes ⇒ if yes, *Who* is it? (check one response)

b1.___your spouse/partner
b2.___your mother
b3.___your father
b4.___your sister
b5.___child's other parent
b6.____your brother
b7.____other relatives
b8.____friend
b9.____neighbor
b10.___someone else

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

[Q9]. Please circle the number which you feel best describes your situation.

HOW OFTEN. . .	**Never**	**Less than once a month**	**1-2 times a month**	**Once a week or more.**
a. do you *give* help to friends, neighbors, or relatives with:				
a1. baby sitting?	1	2	3	4
a2. transportation?	1	2	3	4
a3. help in emergencies?	1	2	3	4
a4. meals or food	1	2	3	4
a5. providing clothes, furniture, toys?	1	2	3	4
a6. advice about child rearing?	1	2	3	4
a7. regular child care?	1	2	3	4
b. do you *receive* help from friends, neighbors, or relatives with:				
b1. baby sitting?	1	2	3	4
b2. transportation?	1	2	3	4
b3. help in emergencies?	1	2	3	4
b4. meals or food	1	2	3	4
b5. providing clothes, furniture, toys?	1	2	3	4
b6. advice about child rearing?	1	2	3	4
b7. regular child care?	1	2	3	4

TO WHAT EXTENT. . .	**Never**	**Less than once a month**	**1-2 times a month**	**Once a week or more.**
c. do you talk to friends or relatives about new or interesting things your child is doing?	1	2	3	4
d. do you talk to friends or relatives when you have a problem or concern about parenting or child rearing?	1	2	3	4
e. do you spend time doing things together as a family?	1	2	3	4
f. do you talk to someone about your own interests, ideas, or future?	1	2	3	4
g. do you talk to someone about personal problems or concerns?	1	2	3	4
h. do you spend time on your own enjoyment or recreation (hobbies, sports, going to movies, parties, etc)?	1	2	3	4
i. are you involved in work, school, and/or community activities?	1	2	3	4
j. do you spend time with other parents with young children (other than coming to ECFE)?	1	2	3	4

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

[Q10] Circle the response which best describes how satisfied you are with the following.

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU...	**Very Dissatisfied**	**Somewhat Dissatisfied**	**Somewhat Satisfied**	**Very Satisfied**	
a. with the advice you get from friends or relatives about parenting/child rearing concerns that you have?	1	2	3	4	
b. with the help you get supervising and caring for your children?	1	2	3	4	
c. with the advice you get from others about personal problems or concerns?	1	2	3	4	
d. with the amount of time you get to spend on your own enjoyment or recreation?	1	2	3	4	
e. with the amount of contact you have with other parents with young children?	1	2	3	4	
f. with the way things are going for you and your family?	1	2	3	4	
g. with the way family members in your household get along together.	1	2	3	4	
h. with your current employment status?	1	2	3	4	Not employed/ not seeking employment 5

[Q11] Which of the following events, if any, occurred in your immediate family

***since last fall*?** (Circle the response which best fits your situation.)

	YES	**NO**
a. Income decreased substantially.	1	2
b. Death of immediate family member.	1	2
c. Chronic illness or disability.	1	2
d. Moved to a new location.	1	2
e. Home destroyed by fire, flood, tornado, etc.	1	2
f. Alcohol or drug problem.	1	2
g. Serious money problems.	1	2
h. Divorce.	1	2
i. Separation from a spouse or partner.	1	2
j. Entered new school.	1	2
k. Pregnancy.	1	2
l. Trouble with teachers at school.	1	2
m. Birth of youngest child.	1	2
n. Trouble providing children with clothing or shoes.	1	2
o. Death of parent.	1	2

Thank you for helping us with our study. We appreciate your help. Please return the survey to the person that gave it to you.

Prepared by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 4.3: Fall/Spring Parent Interview Guide

SPRING PARENT INTERVIEW

Introduction

- *I want to begin by giving you a chance to think about some of the things you do as a parent. We know that no two children are exactly alike and no two parents are the same. My questions will get at some of the ways you approach being a parent and some of your thoughts about your child. There aren't any right or wrong answers.*

- *I'm taping our conversation today. You're comments are really important and I want to listen carefully and have good notes too, so the tape is really helpful.*

- *Do you have any questions? I guess we're all set.*

Questions

Let's begin with some questions about _____(name of enrolled child).

1. Tell me a little about your child _____(parent's name). What's _____(child's name) like?
2. Okay, your child is _____years old. What are _____year olds like?
   [probe, if needed: What stands out to you about ___year olds?]

3. Children grow and change very quickly and they learn in different ways. What have you noticed recently about how _____(child's name) learns?

Transition

We know there are times when all parents feel really full of love for a child and other times when we don't feel so loving; when we're really frustrated. We also know we behave differently depending on how we feel.

4. What do you do when you want to show your child love?
5. What do you do when you don't feel so loving--you know, when your patience is the size of a pea?

6. Has the way you express your feelings toward your child, when you're frustrated, changed in any way in the last few months?

7. How do you try to get your child to do what you want him/her to do?
   [Optional clarifications, if needed: How do you try to get your child to mind you, or obey you, or do what you want?]

Most recent modifications made by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN (1984). Adapted from interview guide developed for Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase I Evaluation by Michael Q. Patton and Betty Cooke. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

8. Have the approaches you use to get your child to mind you changed in any way in the last few months?

9. We've talked about what you do when you feel frustrated, now I want you to tell me what you do *when your child feels* angry or frustrated. What do you do when your child seems angry or frustrated?

Transition
Okay, we've been talking a lot about your child and what you do with your child. Now I'd like you to think about the work you do as a parent.
10. What kinds of words would you use to describe your job as_____'s (child's name) parent?

11. Ok, you just described your job as a parent. Now tell me what you're trying to accomplish when you do those things; what is it that you feel you're working toward when you do your parenting job?

12. I would like you to tell me how you think your job as a parent will change. In a few years _____(child's name) will start kindegarten. In what ways do you feel your job as parent will change when you have a school age child?

Transition
We've found that most parents have some things they feel they do well as a parent, and some things they don't feel they do so well.
13. What do you do well as a parent?

14. What do you not do so well as a parent?

15. In your interview at the beginning of the program I asked you what you didn't do well as a parent. You said "_____". How do you feel about that now?

[Before the interview, fill in text from fall transcript.]

Most recent modifications made by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN (1984). Adapted from interview guide developed for Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase I Evaluation by Michael Q. Patton and Betty Cooke. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Transition

We're almost done. For my last two questions I want you to think about your experience in Early Childhood Family Education.

16. What changes, if any, have you noted in your child or family from participating in ECFE?

17. What are the main things you yourself have gotten from participating in ECFE?

18. Those are all the questions I have. Is there anything else you want to say about your experiences as a parent or in ECFE?

Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with me about your child and your thoughts on parenting. We're glad you're part of ECFE.

Most recent modifications made by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN (1984). Adapted from interview guide developed for Changing Times, Changing Families--Phase I Evaluation by Michael Q. Patton and Betty Cooke. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 4.4: Stimulated Response Interview Guide

ECFE Stimulated Response Interview Guide

Introduction

I'm glad you could come _____(name of participant). Today we'll have a chance to look at the tapes we made of you and _____(child's name). You probably remember we taped three different times. What I'm going to do is go through each segment and stop the tape at different times so we can talk about what you see.

The questions I'll ask you are real easy. They are also the kind of questions that have no right or wrong answer. For example, I'll ask you what you notice in the segment we view and your reactions.

Most parents we've interviewed feel the questions are very general. They are general because we want to understand what parents notice and how they feel and talk about what they see. We don't want to put words in your mouth by asking real specific questions. It's parent words, your words, that are important.

When we talk together about the video I will be tape recording our conversation so I'll have good notes. Do you have any questions before we start?

1. Play In home parent-child segment.
Ask the following open-ended questions (1a, and 1b) at each break point: (Ask one form of 1a and 1 b)

1a. What was happening here?
What kinds of things did you notice?

1b. What are your reactions to what you saw?
What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?

2. Play program site parent-child segment.
Ask the following open-ended questions (2a, and 2b) at each break point: (Ask one form of 2a and 2b)

2a. What was happening here?
What kinds of things did you notice?

2b. What are your reactions to what you saw?
What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

ECFE Stimulated Response Interview Guide (*Continued)*

3. Do you remember when I first interviewed you and I asked you to describe your job as _____ _____'s (child's name) parent? When you think back about what you've just watched on the video, what words would you use to describe what you're doing as _____'s (child's name) parent?

4. Play child only segment.
Ask the following open-ended questions (4a, and 4b) at each break point: (Ask one form of 4a and 4b)

4a. What was happening here?
What kinds of things did you notice?

4b. What are your reactions to what you saw?
What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?

5. SRI Closure Question: Those are all the questions I have. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the videos?

6. FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION: [Optional Teaching Opportunity]

Before you go I want to tell you about a couple of things I saw on the tapes. [Discuss, point out, positive parent-child interactions]

7. CONCLUSION
Thanks for taking time to watch the tapes and discuss them with me. When we're finished with this project we'll give you a copy of the tape.

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 4.5: Participation Record

Participant Name/Code Number_____

Participation Record Completed by (name)_____

Changing Times, Changing Families II

ECFE PARTICIPATION RECORD--INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION PARTICIPANT

Directions: The parent listed on this form is participating in a statewide study. We need to know about the kind and amount of exposure this parent has to ECFE during the 1994-1995 program year. Please complete this form and return to your district's site evaluator _____as soon as possible following your work with this participant. The information you provide is confidential. Individuals will not be identified in any reports. If you have any questions about this study please ask your site evaluator or contact Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Education, telephone number (612)296-6130.

Type of Participation/ECFE Exposure:	**Total ECFE Exposure (Hours/Month)**									
	Sept.	***Oct.***	***Nov.***	***Dec.***	***Jan.***	***Feb.***	***March***	***April***	***May***	***June***
Parent-Child Classes										
Parent Only Classes										
Home Visits										
Special one time events (list):										
Other (list):										

OPTIONAL:

(1) Please attach any narrative information about the substance of the participant's ECFE exposure during reported contact hours.

(2) Add any comments/insights you may have about what supported or limited your effectiveness in working with this family.

Appendix 5.1: Parent Interview Analysis Summary

Parent Interview--Analysis Summary ***Revised* Spring 1995** **Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education** **Changing Times, Changing Families II**	Participant I.D. #_____ Evaluator Name_____ Reviewer Name _____ Child's Age_____

Q 1-2 *Tell me about your child...* *What are __yr. olds like?*	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general *B. Content:* 1____Displays specific awareness/knowledge of own child. 2____Developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development) 3____Developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development) 4____Mixed descriptors (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors) 5____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child. 6____Respondent uncertain. 7____Other: [Provide example and indicate rating label.]
Q3 *What have you noticed about how _____ learns?*	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general *B. Content:* 1____Displays specific awareness/knowledge of own child. 2____Developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development) 3____Developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development) 4____Mixed descriptors (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors) 5____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child. 6____Respondent uncertain. 7____Other: [Provide example and indicate rating label.]
Q4 *What do you do when you want to show love?*	SKIP--DON'T CODE

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring (*Continued*)

Q5

When you don't feel so loving?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content:

1____Developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development)
- 1a_____Remove themselves or their children from the situation.
- 1b_____Redirect their children's attention to other activities.
- 1c_____Offer acceptable choices.
- 1d_____Think before acting.
- 1e_____Involve another adult.
- 1f_____Talk about, explain the situation to their children.
- 1g_____Other: (describe)

2____Developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development)
- 2a____Yelling, screaming
- 2b____Hitting, spanking, slapping
- 2c____Verbal putdowns, ridicule
- 2d____Unexplained physical separation/isolation.
- 2e____Emotionally shut child out (ignore child).
- 2f____Other: (describe)

3____Mixed descriptors (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors)
4____Respondent uncertain.
5____Other [Indicate rating label and provide example.]:

Q6

Has the way you express your feelings toward your child, when you're frustrated, changed in any way in the last few months?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content

1. Change described
   - a ____ Increase or start doing appropriate behaviors
   - b ____ Decrease or stop doing inappropriate behaviors
   - c ____ Change in quality of behavior
   - d ____ Change in feelings
   - e ____ Other: (describe)

2 ____ No change described
3 ____ Respondent uncertain
4 ____ Other: (describe)

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring (*Continued*)

Q7

How do you try to get your child to do what you want them to do?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors(specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content:

1____Displays specific awareness/knowledge of own child.
2____Developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development)
- a____Tell child what to do
- b____Reason, explain situation
- c____Showing or modeling what to do
- d____Repetition (of modeling and/or verbal explanation)
- e____Give child choices
- f____Make a game of situation
- g____Model or demonstrate behavior/skills helpful to child
- h____Offer rewards/consequences
- i____Observe/understand context, then choose strategy(adapt to child's needs/point of view)
- j____Other: (describe)

3____Developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development)
- a____Ridicule, make fun of child
- b____Yell, scream, verbal put downs
- c____Physically punish: spank, slap, hit
- d____Leave alone, ignore
- e____Other: (describe)

4____Mixed descriptors (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors)
5____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child.
6____Respondent uncertain.
7____Other [Indicate rating label and provide example.]:

Q8

Have the approaches you use to get your child to mind you changed in any way in the last few months?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content

1. Change described
   - a ____ Increase or start doing appropriate behaviors
   - b ____ Decrease or stop doing inappropriate behaviors
   - c ____ Change in quality of behavior
   - d ____ Change in feelings
   - e ____ Other: (describe)

2 ____ No change described
3 ____ Respondent uncertain
4 ____ Other: (describe)

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring (*Continued*)

Q9

What do you do when your child seems angry or frustrated?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors(specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content:

1____Displays specific awareness/knowledge of own child.
2____Developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development)
- a____Observe, attempt to identify problem
- b____Leave alone, ignore or physically separate awhile so child can regain composure.
- c____Distract, try to involve child in something else, redirect.
- d____Allow children to be angry, let them express angry feelings.
- e____Reason, explain situation after child calms down.
- f____Physically hold child to help child get control.
- g____Talk calmly, establish eye contact.
- h____Model or demonstrate behaviors/skills helpful to child.
- i____Other: (describe)

3____Developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development)
- a____Ridicule, make fun of child
- b____Yelling, screaming, verbal put downs
- c____Hitting, spanking, slapping
- d____Unexplained physical separation, isolation
- e____Ignore child (emotional isolation)
- f____Hugs and kisses
- g____Other: (describe)

4____Mixed descriptors (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors)
5____Respondent uncertain.
6____Other [Indicate rating label and provide example.]:
7____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child.

Q10

How would you describe your job as _____'s (child's name) parent?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content:

1____Self focused descriptors (manage parent health/emotional issues, parent self-care, parent vocational/educational advancement, manage multiple responsibilities)
2____Environment focused descriptors (keep house clean, provide play/quiet areas, toys, books)
3____Basic care focused descriptors(health/safety/basic needs)
4____Child development focused descriptors (communicate with child, give time/attention, show patience/listen, observe child, think before acting, encourage child, support self confidence,model or demonstrate behavior/skills helpful to child, guidance/control strategies)
5____Vague/general ("do what's best")
6____Other:(List)

7____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child.

C. Appropriateness

a____Appropriate (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development).
b____Mixed (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors).
c____Inappropriate (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development).

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring (*Continued)*

Q11 *What are you trying to accomplish when you do those things; what is it that you feel you're working toward when you do your parenting job?*	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general *B. Content:* 1____Discusses child purposes. Parent discusses purposes which are based on parent's interpretation of her child's behavior. 2____Discusses parent purposes for child which are child-focused. Discusses parent purpose for the child based on what she sees as child's need. 3____Discusses parent purposes for child which are parent-focused. Discusses purposes for child which are based on parent's needs in relation to child. 4____Discusses parent purposes which are self focused. Discusses purposes for parent which are based on parent's needs unrelated to child. 5____Other: (list) 6____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child. *C. Appropriateness* a____Appropriate (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development). b____Mixed (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors). c____Inappropriate (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development).
Q12 *How will your role change when you have a school age child?*	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples) 2____Somewhat vague/general *B. Content:* 1____Displays specific awareness/knowledge of own child (may mention specific attribute/characteristic of child and discuss how attribute may be supported at older age). 2____Developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development) 3____Developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development) 4____Mixed descriptors (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors) 5____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child. 6____Respondent uncertain. 7____Other [Indicate rating label and provide example.]:

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring (*Continued)*

Q13

What do you do well as a parent?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content:

[check all that apply]

1____Uncertain, not sure
2____"Nothing"
3____Self focused descriptors (manage parent health/emotional issues, parent self-care, parent vocational/educational advancement, manage multiple responsibilities)
4____Environment focused descriptors (keep house clean, provide play/quiet areas, toys, books)
5____Basic care focused descriptors(health/safety/basic needs)
6____Child development focused descriptors (communicate with child, give time/attention, show patience/listen, observe child, think before acting, encourage child, support self confidence,model or demonstrate behavior/skills helpful to child, guidance/control strategies)
7____Vague/general ("do what's best")
8____Other:(describe)

9____Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of own child.

C. Appropriateness

a____Appropriate (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development).
b____Mixed (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors).
c____Inappropriate (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development).

Q14

What do you not do so well as a parent?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content:

[check all that apply]

1____Uncertain, not sure
2____"Everything"
3____Self focused descriptors (manage parent health/emotional issues, parent self-care, parent vocational/educational advancement, manage multiple responsibilities)
4____Environment focused descriptors (keep house clean, provide play/quiet areas, toys, books)
5____Basic care focused descriptors(health/safety/basic needs)
6____Child development focused descriptors (communicate with child, give time/attention, show patience/listen, observe child, think before acting, encourage child, support self confidence, guidance/control strategies)
7____Knowledge focused descriptors
8____Vague/general ("do what's best")
9____Other:(describe)

10____Descriptors suggest reflection on parenting skills, need for fine tuning or development of child focused responses and reflect a balanced self appraisal in Q 13 and Q 14 combined.

C. Appropriateness

a____Appropriate (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development).
b____Mixed (uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors).
c____Inappropriate (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development).

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring (*Continued*)

Q15
In your interview at the beginning of the program I asked you what you didn't do well as a parent. You said "_____". How do you feel about that now?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content

1. Change described
   a ____ Increase or start doing appropriate behaviors
   b ____ Decrease or stop doing inappropriate behaviors
   c ____ Change in quality of behavior
   d ____ Change in feelings
   e ____ Other: (describe)

2 ____ No change described
3 ____ Respondent uncertain
4 ____ Other: (describe)

Q16
What changes, if any, have you noted in your child or family from participating in ECFE?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content

Positive Change Described

1 Positive child changes described.
   a.____My child seems pretty much the same now as she/he was last fall.
   b.____My child seems more independent.
   c.____My child has more self confidence.
   d.____My child's language development and communication skills have improved.
   e.____My child gets along better with other children.
   f.____My child gets along better with other adults.
   g.____Other: (describe)

2. Positive family changes described.
   a.____Increased discussion between adult parents.
   b.____Improved relationships among family members.
   c.____Other: (describe)

3.____Both child and family positive changes described (check after checking areas of change above).

Negative Changes Described

4.____Negative child changes described
   (list)
5.____Negative family changes described
   (list)
6.____Both child and family negative changes described

Mixed Changes Described

7.____Both positive and negative changes described (check after checking areas above)

No Change

8.____No change described.

Other

9. ____Respondent uncertain.
10.____Other: (describe)

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Parent Interview Analysis Summary--Revised Spring(*Continued*)

Q17
What are the main things you have gotten from participating in ECFE?

A. Quality of Response

1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2____Somewhat vague/general

B. Content

Positive Outcomes

1. Mentioned general theme
   - 1a.____Increased feelings of support from others, knowing they are "not alone" in their feelings and experiences and that other parents have similar problems and concerns.
   - 1b.____Increased sense of confidence and self-esteem as a parent.
   - 1c.____Increased knowledge, awareness, and understanding about children and child development and the parental role in relation to child development.
   - 1d.____Changed perceptions for themselves as parents and for their children based on increased knowledge, awareness and understanding about children.
   - 1e.____Changes in behavior based on increased feelings of support from others, increased self confidence, increased knowledge, and changed perceptions and expectations of their children and themselves.
   - 1f.____Other: (describe)

2. Discussed specific examples of behavior change
   - 2a.____Stopping to observe, listen, and think before acting with their children.
   - 2b.____Beginning to respond to their children based on child's perspective, becoming more in tune to and sensitive to their children's point of view.
   - 2c.____Spending more time interacting with their children and having new ideas of activities to do with their children.
   - 2d.____Other: (describe)

Negative Outcomes

3. ____Negative outcomes or experience described. (describe)
4. ____Positive and negative outcomes or experiences described. (describe)

No Change

5. ____**No change** or benefits described

Other

6. ____Respondent uncertain
7. ____Other: (describe)

Q18
Those are all the questions I have. Is there anything else you want to say about your experiences as a parent or in ECFE?

Other Comments:

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 5.2: Stimulated Response Interview Analysis Summary

Stimulated Response Interview-- **Analysis Summary** **Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education** **Changing Times, Changing Families II**	Participant I.d.# _____ Evaluator Name _____ Reviewer Name _____ Child's Age _____

In Home Parent-Child Interaction Segment

Q 1a. & Q 1b. *Q1a. What was happening here?* *or* *What kinds of things did you notice?* *Q1b. What are your reactions to what you saw?* *or* *What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?*	***A. Clarity** of parent response* 1 ____ Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2 ____ Somewhat vague/general ***B. Scope** of parent response* To what extent did the parent talk about the parent-child interactions you observed in the video segment? 1 ____ Parent discussed most of what I observed. 2 ____ Parent discussed some of what I observed. 3 ____ Parent discussed very little of what I observed. 4 ____ Parent discussed none of what I observed. ***C. Content*** 1. Descriptive Comments: Parent describes behavior she/he observes in the video. a ____ Describes child behavior/action. b ____ Describes object/toy, situation, and/or task. c ____ Describes parent behavior in relation to child. d ____ Describes other behavior or aspect of the environment. e ____ Other: (describe) 2. Interpretive Comments: Parent explains behavior observed in the video. a ____ Comments interpret/explain child behavior. b ____ Comments interpret/explain object, toy, situation, and/or task. c ____ Comments interpret/explain parent behavior in relation to child. d ____ Comments interpret/explain parent behavior unrelated to child, object/toy, situation, and/or task. e ____ Other: (describe) 3. Reflective Comments: Comments demonstrate that the parent achieved new understanding about their child or themselves as parents. a ____ Comments demonstrate new insight/awareness of child's behavior, skills, abilities. b ____ Comments demonstrate new insight/awareness of their own parenting behavior. c ____ In addition to *a* or *b*, parent discusses implications of their new insight/awareness for how he/she approaches parenting. d ____ Other: (describe) ***D. Appropriateness*** 1 ____ Parent used developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development) 2 ____ Parent used developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development) 3 ____ Parent used mixed descriptors (used both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors) 4 ____ Other: (describe) Too vague/general to assess ***E. Other*** 1 ____ Parent uncertain how to respond.

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Program Site Parent-Child Interaction Segment

Q 2a. & Q 2b.

Q2a. What was happening here?
or
What kinds of things did you notice?

Q2b. What are your reactions to what you saw?
or
What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?

***A. Clarity** of parent response*

1 ____ Clear descriptors (specific examples provided)
2 ____ Somewhat vague/general

***B. Scope** of parent response*

To what extent did the parent talk about the parent-child interactions you observed in the video segment?

1 ____ Parent discussed most of what I observed.
2 ____ Parent discussed some of what I observed.
3 ____ Parent discussed very little of what I observed.
4 ____ Parent discussed none of what I observed.

C. Content

1. Descriptive Comments: Parent describes behavior she/he observes in the video.
   a ____ Describes child behavior/action.
   b ____ Describes object/toy, situation, and/or task.
   c ____ Describes parent behavior in relation to child.
   d ____ Describes other behavior or aspect of the environment.
   e ____ Other: (describe)

2. Interpretive Comments: Parent explains behavior observed in the video.
   a ____ Comments interpret/explain child behavior.
   b ____ Comments interpret/explain object, toy, situation, and/or task.
   c ____ Comments interpret/explain parent behavior in relation to child.
   d ____ Comments interpret/explain parent behavior unrelated to child, object/toy, situation, and/or task.
   e ____ Other: (describe)

3. Reflective Comments: Comments demonstrate that the parent achieved new understanding about their child or themselves as parents.

   a ____ Comments demonstrate new insight/awareness of child's behavior, skills, abilities.
   b ____ Comments demonstrate new insight/awareness of their own parenting behavior.
   c ____ In addition to *a* or *b*, parent discusses implications of their new insight/awareness for how he/she approaches parenting.
   d ____ Other: (describe)

D. Appropriateness

1 ____ Parent used developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development)
2 ____ Parent used developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development)
3 ____ Parent used mixed descriptors (used both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors)
4 ____ Other: (describe) Too vague/general to assess.

E. Other

1 ____ Parent uncertain how to respond.

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Stimulated Response Interview--Analysis Summary, *Continued*

Parent Role Discussion

Q3. *When you think back about what you've just watched on the video, what words would you use to describe what you're doing as _____'s (child's name) parent?*	***A. Clarity** of parent response* 1 ____ Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2 ____ Somewhat vague/general ***B. Content*** 1 ____ Parent focused descriptors. Comments focus on parent actions which serve parent needs/motives 2 ____ Object/task focused descriptors. Comments focus on parent action to complete a task, work with an object/toy. 3 ____ Basic care descriptors. Comments focus on parent behavior intended to satisfy child's health/safety needs. 4 ____ Child development focused descriptors. Comments focus on parent behavior which is intended to encourage child's development (communicate with child, give time/attention, show patience/listen, observe child, think before acting, encourage child, support self confidence, model or demonstrate behavior/skills helpful to child, guidance/control strategies). 5 ____ Other: Parent discusses content unrelated to question (e.g. reactions to being video taped. 6 ____ Comments display integration between specific knowledge of child and awareness of child development. ***C. Appropriateness*** 1 ____ Parent used developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development) 2 ____ Parent used developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development) 3 ____ Parent used mixed descriptors (used both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors) 4 ____ Other: (describe) Too vague/general to assess appropriateness. ***D. Other*** 1 ____ Parent uncertain how to respond.

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Child Only Segment

Q4a. & Q4b *Q4a. What was happening here?* *or* *What kinds of things did you notice?* *Q4b. What are your reactions to what you saw?* *or* *What were you thinking about when you watched this segment?*	***A. Clarity** of parent response* 1 ____ Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2 ____ Somewhat vague/general ***B. Scope** of parent response* To what extent did the parent talk about child behaviors you observed in the video segment? 1 ____ Parent discussed most of what I observed. 2 ____ Parent discussed some of what I observed. 3 ____ Parent discussed very little of what I observed. 4 ____ Parent discussed none of what I observed. ***C. Content*** 1. Descriptive Comments: Parent describes behavior she/he observes in the video. a ____ Describes child behavior/action. b ____ Describes object/toy, situation, and/or task. c ____ Describes other behavior or aspect of the environment. d ____ Other: (describe) 2. Interpretive Comments: Parent explains behavior observed in the video. a ____ Comments interpret/explain child behavior. b ____ Comments interpret/explain object/toy, situation or task. c ____ Comments interpret or explain actions or objects unrelated to child. d ____ Other: (describe) 3. Reflective Comments: Comments demonstrate that the parent achieved new understanding about their child or themselves as parents. a ____ Comments demonstrate new insight/awareness of child's behavior, skills, abilities. b ____ In addition to *a*, parent discusses implications of their new insight/awareness for how he/she approaches parenting. d ____ Other: (describe) ***D. Appropriateness*** 1 ____ Parent used developmentally appropriate descriptors (reflects general knowledge/awareness of child development) 2 ____ Parent used developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development) 3 ____ Parent used mixed descriptors (used both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors) 4 ____ Other: (describe)Too vague/general to assess appropriateness. ***E. Other*** 1 ____ Parent uncertain how to respond.

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 5.3: Parent Interview Critical Codes

Changing Times, Changing Families II

PARENT INTERVIEW--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes)

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent Knowledge/Awareness **Q 1-2, Q3**	L-1: Developmentally inappropriate descriptors used. L-2: Mixed descriptors used. L-1: B3 L-2: B4	M-1: Specific awareness of own child. Somewhat vague or general discussion; may preclude assessment of appropriateness. M-2: Specific awareness of own child. Developmental appropriate descriptors used. M-1: B1 M-2: B 1 and 2	H: Specific awareness of own child, developmentally appropriate descriptors. Displays integration of child development knowledge and knowledge of own child. H: B5
Parent Behavior (Parent Self Control) **Q5**	L-1: Developmentally inappropriate descriptors used (uncertainty may also be expressed). L-2: Respondent uncertain; respondent expresses uncertainty about how he/she handles their feelings of frustration. In most cases expression of uncertainty precludes assessment of appropriateness. L-3: Developmentally mixed descriptors used (uncertainty may also be expressed). L-1: B2 L-2: B4 L-3: B3	M: Developmentally appropriate descriptors used, 1-2 options mentioned. M: B1 (1-2 options selected)	H: Developmentally appropriate descriptors used; 3+ options mentioned. H: B1 (3+ options selected)

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

PARENT INTERVIEW--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes), *continued*

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent Behavior (Guidance) **Q7**	L-1: Developmentally inappropriate. L-2: Mixed descriptors L-3: Respondent uncertain; appropriateness can not be determined. L-4: 1-2 developmentally appropriate strategies mentioned but child specific behaviors are not mentioned. L-5: Describes child specific behaviors but strategies are not mentioned. L-1: B3 L-2: B4 L-3: B6 L-4: B2 L-5: B1	M-1: Specific child behaviors are mentioned; 1-2 strategies described. M-2: 3+ strategies described and child behaviors. M-1: B1 B2 (1-2 strategies) M-2: B1 B2 (3+ strategies)	H: Developmentally appropriate, child behaviors mentioned, 3+ strategies described. Discussion demonstrates integration of child development concepts and specific knowledge of own child. H: B2 (3+ strategies) B5
Parent Behavior (Sensitivity/Responsiveness) **Q9**	L-1: Developmentally inappropriate descriptors used. L-2: Mixed descriptors used. L-3: Respondent uncertain; appropriateness can not be determined. L-4: Developmentally appropriate strategies mentioned but child specific behaviors are not mentioned. L-5: Describes child specific behaviors but strategies are not mentioned. Developmentally appropriate. L-1: B3 L-2: B4 L-3: B6 L-4: B2 L-5: B1	M-1: Specific child behaviors are mentioned; 1-2 strategies described. M-2: 3+ strategies described and child behaviors. M-1: B1 B2 (1-2 strategies) M-2: B1 B2 (3+ strategies)	H: Developmentally appropriate, child behaviors mentioned, 3+ strategies described. Discussion demonstrates integration of child development concepts and specific knowledge of own child. H: B2 (3+ strategies) B7

page 131

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

PARENT INTERVIEW--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes), *continued*

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent Role (Description) **Q10**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors. L-2: Mixed descriptors L-3: Self focused descriptors (adult needs/responsibilities apart from the child) may or may not include inappropriate or mixed descriptors. May or may not include environmental or basic care descriptors. L-4: Other: Don't know, unsure. May or may not include inappropriate or mixed descriptors. L-5: Vague General "Do what's best." L-1: C3 L-2: C2 L-3: B1 L-4: B6 (don't know, unsure) L-5: B5	M-1 Environment and/or basic care focused. M-2: Child development focused descriptors. May or may not include self focused, environment or basic care descriptors. M-1: B2,3 M-2: B4	H: Displays integration of developmentally appropriate descriptors and specific knowledge of child. Child development descriptors may or may not include self focused, environmental or basic care focused descriptors. H: B7
Parent Role (Purpose) **Q11**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors. L-2: Mixed descriptors L-3: Self focused purposes. Purposes based on parent's needs unrelated to child. L-4: Other--don't know, unsure. L-5: Other--vague/general, "do best I can". L-6: Purposes for child which are based on parent need. "do things so child will love me." L-1: C3 L-2: C2 L-3: B4 L-4: B5 (Don't know, unsure) L-5: B5 (Vague/general, "do best I can") L-6: B3	M: Child purposes based on parent interpretation of child's behavior. Parent purposes for child based on what parent sees as child's need. M: B 1 or 2	H: Displays integration. Discusses parent purposes for child which are based on what she sees as child's needs. H: B7

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

PARENT INTERVIEW--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes), *continued*

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent Role (Anticipation of Role Change) **Q12**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors L-2: Mixed descriptors L-3: Respondent uncertain L-1: B3 L-2: B4 L-3: B6	M: May describe specific knowledge of own child and describe how attribute/characteristic may be supported at older age. Developmentally appropriate; displays general knowledge/awareness of child development of school age child; may be somewhat general. M: B2	H: Displays integration; developmentally appropriate descriptors, awareness of own child, needs of older children and purpose clarity. H: B5
Parent Self Assessment (Strengths) **Q13**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors used. (Reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development.) L-2: Mixed descriptors used. (Uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors.) L-3: "Nothing"; respondent can not describe anything they do well. L-4: Uncertain, not sure L-5: Vague/general response; "do what's best". L-6: Comments emphasize self-focused descriptors (focused on parent needs, responsibilities). L-1: C3 L-2: C2 L-3: B2 L-4: B1 L-5: B8 L-6: B3	M-1: Comments emphasize environment and/or basic care. Self focused descriptors may be included. M-2: Comments emphasize child development focused descriptors in general terms, specific examples not provided. M-1: B4 and/or B5 M-2: B6	H: Comments emphasize child development descriptors and include specific examples. Basic care and/or environment, and/or self focused descriptors may be mentioned. H: B9

page 133

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

PARENT INTERVIEW--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes), *continued*

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent Self Assessment (Weaknesses) **Q14**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors used. (Reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development.) L-2: Mixed descriptors used. (Uses both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors.) L-3: "Everything"; respondent suggest most of what they do is weak. L-4: Uncertain, not sure. L-5: Vague/general response. L-1: C3 L-2: C2 L-3: B2 L-4: B1 L-5: B8	M-1: Respondents emphasize self focused, environmental, basic care descriptors. M-2: Respondent emphasizes need for more information/knowledge about child development. M-3: Respondent emphasizes general child development descriptors. M-1: B3,4, or 5 M-2: B7 M-3: B6	H: Respondents emphasize child development focused descriptors which suggest reflection on own parenting skills and/or need for fine tuning or development of specific strategies. There is a sense of reflection and balanced appraisal in Q 13 and Q14. H: B10

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 5.4: SRI Critical Codes

STIMULATED RESPONSE INTERVIEW (SRI)--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes)

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent discussion of in-home video. **SQ1** Parent discussion of program video. **SQ2**	L-1: Parent uses developmentally inappropriate descriptors (reflects inaccurate knowledge/awareness of child development). L-2: parent uses mixed descriptors (both developmentally appropriate and inappropriate descriptors). L-3: Parent unsure/uncertain how to respond. L-4: Parent uses general or vague terms; precludes assessment of appropriateness. L-5: Parent describes and or interprets other aspects of environment unrelated to child, parent-child interaction, or task. L-1: D2 L-2: D3 L-3: E L-4: D4 L-5: C1d and/or C2d	M-1: Parent comments emphasize description and/or interpretation of object, toy, situation, and/or task. M-2: Parent comments emphasize description and/or interpretation of child behavior/action. M-3: Parent comments emphasize description and/or interpretation of parent behavior in relation child. M-4: parent comments emphasize reflection about child or parenting skill/behavior. M-1: C1b and/or C2b M-2: C1a and/or C2a M-3: C1c and/or C2c M-4: C3a or b	H-1: Parent comments emphasize description *and* interpretation of child behavior *and* parent behavior. H-2: Parent comments include description and interpretation of child behavior and parent behavior and reflective comments. H-3: Parent makes reflective comments and discusses implication of comments. H-1: C1ac *and* C2ac H-2: C1ac *and* C2ac *and* C3ab H-3: C1ac *and* C2ac *and* C3c

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

STIMULATED RESPONSE INTERVIEW (SRI)--RESPONSE TYPES (Critical Codes), *continued*

Question	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Parent discussion of Parent role. **SQ3**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors used. L-2: Mixed descriptors used. L-3: Parent uses vague or general terms which preclude assessment of appropriateness. L-4: Parent discusses content unrelated to question. L-5: Parent uncertain how to respond. L-6: Parent focused (self focused) descriptors. L-1: C2 L-2: C3 L-4: B5 L-5: D L-6: B1	M-1: Basic care descriptors. M-2: Object/task descriptors used. M-3: Child development focused descriptors emphasized. M-1: B3 M-2: B2 M-3: B4	H: Parent comments display integration of knowledge/awareness of child development, specific knowledge of child. H: B 6
Parent discussion of child-only video. **SQ4**	L-1: Inappropriate descriptors used. L-2: Mixed descriptors used. L-3: Parent unsure/uncertain how to respond. L-4: Parent uses general/vague terms; precludes assessment of appropriateness. L-5: Parent describes/interprets aspects unrelated to their child. L-1: D2 L-2: D3 L-3: E L-4: D4 L-5: C1c *and/or* C2c	M-1: Parent comments emphasize description/interpretation of object, toy, situation or task. M-2: Parent comments emphasize description *or* interpretation of child behavior. M-3: Parent comments emphasize reflection; new awareness/insight of child's behavior, skills, abilities. M-1: C1b *and or* C2b M-2: C1a *or* C2a M-3: C3a	H-1: Parent comments emphasize description *and* interpretation of child's behavior. H-2: Parent comments include reflection (noting new awareness/insight of child's behavior, skills, abilities) as well as emphasizing description and interpretation of child's behavior. H-3: Parent makes reflective comments based on description and interpretation and discusses implications of new insight for how she/he approaches parenting. H-1: C1a *and* C2a H-2: C1a *and* C2a *and* C3a H-3: C1a *and* C2a *and* c3a *and* C3b

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 5.5: Fall Interviews--Score Sheet

Participant I.D.#_____

Site Evaluator's Name_____

FALL INTERVIEW SCORE SHEET

Directions: Complete score sheet after completing both the Parent Interview and Stimulated Response Interview analysis summaries. Refer to Parent Interview and Stimulated Response Interview Response Type Tables for response type codes. All "Q" numbers refer to questions on the Parent Interview. All "SQ" numbers refer to questions on the Stimulated Response Interview.

Scoring: Scores are directly related to response type; all **L** response types receive 1 point, all **M** response types receive 2 points, and all **H** response types receive 3 points.

Question Scores

Concept Area	*Q Number*	*Response Type*	*Score**
I. Knowledge/Awareness Own Child			
Child description	**Q1-2**		
Child learning	**Q3**		
Observation of own child	**SQ4**		
II. Parent Behavior			
Parent self control	**Q5**		
Guidance	**Q7**		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness	**Q9**		
P-C Interaction (In-home observation)	**SQ1**		
P-C Interaction (Program)	**SQ2**		
III. Parent Role Perception			
Description	**Q10**		
Purpose	**Q11**		
Anticipation of how role changes.	**Q12**		
Description/observation of parent role in specific situation.	**SQ3**		
IV. Parent Self Assessment			
Strengths	**Q13**		
Weaknesses	**Q14**		

Concept Area Scores

Concept Area	*Concept Area Q Scores*	*TOTAL Concept Area Score*
I. Knowledge/Awareness Own Child	[Q1-2 + Q3 + SQ4]	
II. Parent Behavior	[Q5+Q7+Q9+SQ1+SQ2]	
III. Parent Role Perception	[Q10+Q11+Q12+SQ3]	
IV. Parent Self Assessment	[Q13+Q14]	

Extensiveness of Discussion: ***(check one)***

_____Limited

_____Moderate

_____Extensive

ESL (English second language)? ***(check one)***

_____Yes

_____No

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Specific Response Information (Transfer coding <u>from Parent Interview Questions</u>)

Q5	*1. Developmentally appropriate descriptors used. (transfer coding):* 1a_____Remove themselves or their children from the situation. 1b_____Redirect their children's attention to other activities. 1c_____Offer acceptable choices. 1d_____Think before acting. 1e_____Involve another adult. 1f_____Talk about, explain the situation to their children. 1g_____Other	*2. Developmentall inappropriate descriptors used. (Transfer coding)* 2a____Yelling, screaming 2b____Hitting, spanking, slapping 2c____Verbal putdowns, ridicule 2d____Unexplained physical separation/isolation. 2e____Emotionally shut child out (ignore child). 2f____Other
Q7	*1. Developmentally appropriate descriptors used. (transfer coding):* a____Tell child what to do b____Reason, explain situation c____Showing or modeling what to do d____Repetition (of modeling and/or verbal explanation) e____Give child choices f____Make a game of situation g____Model or demonstrate behavior/skills helpful to child h____Offer rewards/consequences i____Observe/understand context, then choose strategy (adapt to child's needs/point of view) j____Other	*2. Developmentall inappropriate descriptors used. (Transfer coding)* a____Ridicule, make fun of child b____Yell, scream, verbal put downs c____Physically punish: spank, slap, hit d____Leave alone, ignore e____Other
Q9	*1. Developmentally appropriate descriptors used. (transfer coding):* a____Observe, attempt to identify problem b____Leave alone, ignore or physically separate awhile so child can regain composure. c____Distract, try to involve child in something else, redirect. d____Allow children to be angry, let them express angry feelings. e____Reason, explain situation after child calms down. f____Physically hold child to help child get control. g____Talk calmly, establish eye contact. h____Model or demonstrate behaviors/skills helpful to child. i_____Other	*2. Developmentally inappropriate descriptors used. (Transfer coding):* a____Ridicule, make fun of child b____Yelling, screaming, verbal put downs c____Hitting, spanking, slapping d____Unexplained physical separation, isolation e____Ignore child (emotional isolation) f____Hugs and kisses g____Other

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 5.6: Spring Interviews--Score Sheet

Participant I.D.#_____

Site Evaluator's Name_____

SPRING INTERVIEW SCORE SHEET

Directions: Complete score sheet after completing both the Parent Interview and Stimulated Response Interview analysis summaries. Refer to Parent Interview and Stimulated Response Interview Response Type Tables for response type codes. All "Q" numbers refer to questions on the Parent Interview. All "SQ" numbers refer to questions on the Stimulated Response Interview.

Scoring: Scores are directly related to response type; all **L** response types receive 1 point, all **M** response types receive 2 points, and all **H** response types receive 3 points.

Question Scores

Concept Area	*Q Number*	*Response Type*	*Score**
I. Knowledge/Awareness Own Child			
Child description	**Q1-2**		
Child learning	**Q3**		
Observation of own child	**SQ4**		
II. Parent Behavior			
Parent self control	**Q5**		
Guidance	**Q7**		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness	**Q9**		
P-C Interaction (In-home observation)	**SQ1**		
P-C Interaction (Program)	**SQ2**		
III. Parent Role Perception			
Description	**Q10**		
Purpose	**Q11**		
Anticipation of how role changes.	**Q12**		
Description/observation of parent role in specific situation.	**SQ3**		
IV. Parent Self Assessment			
Strengths	**Q13**		
Weaknesses	**Q14**		

Concept Area Scores

Concept Area	*Concept Area Q Scores*	*TOTAL Concept Area Score*
I. Knowledge/Awareness Own Child	[Q1-2 + Q3 + SQ4]	
II. Parent Behavior	[Q5+Q7+Q9+SQ1+SQ2]	
III. Parent Role Perception	[Q10+Q11+Q12+SQ3]	
IV. Parent Self Assessment	[Q13+Q14]	

Extensiveness of Discussion: ***(check one)***

_____Limited

_____Moderate

_____Extensive

ESL (English second language)? ***(check one)***

_____Yes

_____No

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Specific Response Information (Transfer coding from Parent Interview Questions)

Q5	*1. Developmentally appropriate descriptors used. (transfer coding):* 1a_____Remove themselves or their children from the situation. 1b_____Redirect their children's attention to other activities. 1c_____Offer acceptable choices. 1d_____Think before acting. 1e_____Involve another adult. 1f_____Talk about, explain the situation to their children. 1g_____Other	*2. Developmentall inappropriate descriptors used. (Transfer coding)* 2a____Yelling, screaming 2b____Hitting, spanking, slapping 2c____Verbal putdowns, ridicule 2d____Unexplained physical separation/isolation. 2e____Emotionally shut child out (ignore child). 2f____Other
Q6	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general	*B. Content* 1. Change described a ____ Increase or start doing appropriate behaviors b ____ Decrease or stop doing inappropriate behaviors c ____ Change in quality of behavior d ____ Change in feelings e ____ Other 2 ____ No change described 3 ____ Respondent uncertain 4 ____ Other
Q7	*1. Developmentally appropriate descriptors used. (transfer coding):* a____Tell child what to do b____Reason, explain situation c____Showing or modeling what to do d____Repetition (of modeling and/or verbal explanation) e____Give child choices f____Make a game of situation g____Model or demonstrate behavior/skills helpful to child h____Offer rewards/consequences i____Observe/understand context, then choose strategy (adapt to child's needs/point of view) j____Other	*2. Developmentall inappropriate descriptors used. (Transfer coding)* a____Ridicule, make fun of child b____Yell, scream, verbal put downs c____Physically punish: spank, slap, hit d____Leave alone, ignore e____Other
Q8	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general	*B. Content* 1. Change described a ____ Increase or start doing appropriate behaviors b ____ Decrease or stop doing inappropriate behaviors c ____ Change in quality of behavior d ____ Change in feelings e ____ Other 2 ____ No change described 3 ____ Respondent uncertain 4 ____ Other

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Q9	*1. Developmentally appropriate descriptors used. (transfer coding):* a____Observe, attempt to identify problem b____Leave alone, ignore or physically separate awhile so child can regain composure. c____Distract, try to involve child in something else, redirect. d____Allow children to be angry, let them express angry feelings. e____Reason, explain situation after child calms down. f____Physically hold child to help child get control. g____Talk calmly, establish eye contact. h____Model or demonstrate behaviors/skills helpful to child. i____Other	*2. Developmentally inappropriate descriptors used. (Transfer coding):* a____Ridicule, make fun of child b____Yelling, screaming, verbal put downs c____Hitting, spanking, slapping d____Unexplained physical separation, isolation e____Ignore child (emotional isolation) f____Hugs and kisses g____Other
Q15	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general	*B. Content* 1. Change described a ____ Increase or start doing appropriate behaviors b ____ Decrease or stop doing inappropriate behaviors c ____ Change in quality of behavior d ____ Change in feelings e ____ Other 2 ____ No change described 3 ____ Respondent uncertain 4 ____ Other
Q16	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general	*B. Content* <u>*Positive Change Described*</u> 1 Positive child changes described. a.____My child seems pretty much the same now as she/he was last fall. b.____My child seems more independent. c.____My child has more self confidence. d.____My child's language development and communication skills have improved. e.____My child gets along better with other children. f.____My child gets along better with other adults. g.____Other 2. Positive family changes described. a.____Increased discussion between adult parents. b.____Improved relationships among family members. c.____Other 3.____Both child and family positive changes described <u>*Negative Changes Described*</u> 4.____Negative child changes described 5.____Negative family changes described 6.____Both child and family negative changes described <u>*Mixed Changes Described*</u> 7.____Both positive and negative changes described <u>*No Change*</u> 8.____No change described. <u>*Other*</u> 9. ____Respondent uncertain. 10.____Other

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Q17	*A. Quality of Response* 1____Clear descriptors (specific examples provided) 2____Somewhat vague/general	*B. Content* *Positive Outcomes* 1. Mentioned general theme 1a.____Increased feelings of support from others, knowing they are "not alone" in their feelings and experiences and that other parents have similar problems and concerns. 1b.____Increased sense of confidence and self-esteem as a parent. 1c.____Increased knowledge, awareness, and understanding about children and child development and the parental role in relation to child development. 1d.____Changed perceptions for themselves as parents and for their children based on increased knowledge, awareness and understanding about children. 1e.____Changes in behavior based on increased feelings of support from others, increased self confidence, increased knowledge, and changed perceptions and expectations of their children and themselves. 1f.____Other: 2. Discussed specific examples of behavior change 2a.____Stopping to observe, listen, and think before acting with their children. 2b.____Beginning to respond to their children based on child's perspective, becoming more in tune to and sensitive to their children's point of view. 2c.____Spending more time interacting with their children and having new ideas of activities to do with their children. 2d.____Other: (describe) *Negative Outcomes* 3. ____Negative outcomes or experience described. 4. ____Positive and negative outcomes or experiences described. *No Change* 5. ____**No change** or benefits described *Other* 6. ____Respondent uncertain 7. ____Other

Developed by Marsha R. Mueller, Evaluation Consultant, Minneapolis, MN. (1984), for use by Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education programs. For more information please contact Betty Cooke, Family Initiatives Specialist, MN Department of Children, Families & Learning, St. Paul, MN.

Appendix 5.7: Development of Parent Behavior Rating Scale

by
Betty Cooke
Early Childhood and Family Initiatives Specialist
Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning
St. Paul, Minnesota

It was determined that some form of scale was needed for coding or rating the parent behavior data on the video tapes. This began a lengthy process of investigating the availability of existing scales, adapting and combining parts of them and then testing, revising and testing again the new scale several times with various groups before arriving at the Parent Behavior Rating Scale used in this evaluation (see Appendix 5.8).

The scale was adapted from the work of:

- Gerald Mahoney, Winthrop College, Center of Excellence in Early Childhood Education, and Amy Powell Wheatley, Children's Hospital Medical Center of Akron, Family Child Learning Center in conjunction with Kent State University, who together first developed their Parent Behavior Rating Scale while with the High/Scope Education Research Foundation at the University of Michigan;

- Ruth Thomas, Lorraine Anderson, Linde Getahun and Betty Cooke in Vocational and Technical Education in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota who developed a revised version of the Mahoney-Powell scale as part of a research project for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education on teaching for transfer of learning; and,

- Byron Egeland, Martha Farrell Erickson and their associates in the Institute of Child Development in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota who developed scales, teaching tasks and scoring manuals as part of the Mother-Child Project.

The scale used in this study developed through many versions as it was tested and reviewed by various groups. Each evolving version of the scale was tested and revised by using it to analyze the data on pilot video tapes of parent-child interaction. The nine concepts selected to include and the exact wording of each item on the scale were fine tuned through this process. Groups involved in the process were the Family Education Resources of Minnesota (FERM) Board of Directors; the 28 site evaluators and their

program coordinators; Professors Byron Egeland, Martha Farrell Erickson and Ruth Thomas from the University of Minnesota, Michael Patton from Union Institute and Marsha R. Mueller, Principal Evaluator . The scale was also read by selected individuals for its cultural sensitivity.

It was determined by the groups and individuals who piloted the PBRS that the nine behavioral concept areas described on it form the core desired outcomes for parents participating in Early Childhood Family Education. These concepts are: enjoyment/acceptance/warmth, sensitivity to child, responsivity, reciprocal engagement, pace, encouragement of sensorimotor and cognitive development, inventiveness/creativity, guidance/encouragement of self-direction and absence of hostility.

Appendix 5.8: Parent Behavior Rating Scale

CHANGING TIMES, CHANGING FAMILIES--PHASE II
MINNESOTA EARLY CHILDHOOD FAMILY EDUCATION
OUTCOME EVALUATION

PARENTAL BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE*

NOTE TO RATERS: The Parental Behavior Rating Scale is intended to obtain the rater's professional assessment of parenting behavior in parent-child interaction observed on video tape on the following nine concepts. These nine concepts are well documented in child development literature. It is also well documented that individuals display behaviors in different ways based on differences in temperament, class, educational and cultural background, etc. However, judgments must be made by educators and other professionals about people to plan programs. Please judge observed behavior on video tape as you would in your educational/professional role. Remember to consider only the objective, observed actions on the video tape in your ratings.

1. Enjoyment/Acceptance/Warmth

This item assesses the parent's enjoyment/interest in interaction with the child. It assesses the extent to which the parent expresses positive affect toward the child and the child's behavior either verbally or non-verbally. Enjoyment/interest/acceptance/warmth is experienced and expressed in response to the child's spontaneous expressions, reactions or behavior when in interaction with the parent. There is enjoyment/interest in the child's being himself/herself rather than the activity the child is pursuing.

1: **Enjoyment/acceptance/warmth is absent**. Parent may show an absence of interest, joy or delight in interaction with the child. Inhibited body language, flat affect, dull voice quality and unvaried facial expression may be characteristic.

1.5:

2: **Enjoyment/acceptance/warmth is seldom manifested**. Parent does not seem to enjoy/be interested in the child per sé or may show little joy and delight in interaction with the child. The parent seldom expresses warmth through touch or voice tone and may not acknowledge effort.

2.5:

3: **Some enjoyment/acceptance/warmth evident**. Parent occasionally manifests delight/interest in child being himself/herself and/or in interaction with the child. The parent expresses affection occasionally through touch and vocal tone. Only performance and unusual feats by the child are acknowledged.

3.5:

4: **Enjoyment/acceptance/warmth occur frequently in the context of a warm relaxed atmosphere**. Parent manifests delight/interest frequently and frequently expresses affection through touch and vocal tone. Parent may verbalize terms of endearment. Parent is generally enthusiastic in expressing emotions toward child and is generous with positive affect.

4.5:

5: **High enjoyment/acceptance/warmth**. Enjoyment/interest is the highlight of the interaction. Parent consistently displays joy, pleasure, delight, surprise, interest, fascination, etc. with the child's behaviors through touch, vocal tones and verbal endearments. Parent notices and affirms ordinary behavior and effort as well as more unusual feats and performance.

* Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

2. Sensitivity to Child

This item examines the extent to which the parent seems to be aware of, observe and understand the child and the child's activity or play interests. This item is assessed by the parent's visual monitoring/observation of the child's behavior or activity, i.e., the parent observes/maintains eye contact with/shows sensitivity to cues from their child and parent's age appropriate language/verbal comments in reference to child's interest. **Parents may be sensitive but not responsive such as in situations where they describe the child's interests but do not follow the child's lead.**

1: **Highly insensitive**. Parent appears to ignore child's show of interest and to ignore clear signals such as crying, fussing and smiling. Parent rarely comments on or watches child's behavior.

1.5:

2: **Low sensitivity**. Parent occasionally shows interest in the child's behavior or activity and notices clear signals such as crying, fussing and smiling. Parent may suddenly notice where child is looking or what child is touching but does not continue to monitor child's behavior.

2.5:

3: **Moderately sensitive.** Parent is aware of the child's interests and notices clear signals such as crying, fussing and smiling; consistently monitors child's behavior but ignores more subtle and hard-to-detect communications from the child, e.g., activity level, distractibility, adaptability, attention span and persistence, reactions to change in stimulation and intensity of response.

3.5:

4: **High sensitivity.** Parent is aware of the child's interests; notices clear signals such as crying, fussing and smiling and monitors the child's behavior but is inconsistent in detecting more subtle and hard-to-detect communications from the child, e.g., activity level, distractibility, adaptability, attention span and persistence, reactions to change in stimulation and intensity of response.

4.5:

5: **Very high sensitivity.** Parent is aware of the child's interests and notices clear signals such as crying, fussing and smiling; consistently monitors the child's behavior and follows interest indicated by subtle and hard-to-detect communications from the child, e.g., activity level, distractibility, adaptability, attention span and persistence, reactions to change in stimulation and intensity of response.

3. Responsivity

This item rates the appropriateness of the parent's responses to the child's behaviors such as facial expression, vocalizations, gestures, signs of comfort/discomfort, body language.

1: **Highly unresponsive.** There is a chronic failure to respond appropriately to the child's behaviors. Parent's interventions and initiation of interaction are shaped largely by the parent's own agenda or signals or information coming from sources of stimulation other than the child. Parent does not offer suggestions or intervene even when requests are made by the child.

1.5:

2: **Unresponsive.** Parent's responses/reactions are inconsistent -- sometimes focused on the child and sometimes on other stimuli -- and may be inappropriate or slow. Parent infrequently offers suggestions of what the child needs or intervenes even when requests are made by the child.

2.5:

* Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

3: **Moderately responsive.** Parent usually responds to the child's behavior but may at times be slow or inappropriate.

3.5:

4: **Responsive.** Parent responds to the child's behavior appropriately and promptly throughout the interaction but is inconsistent in responding to subtle and hard-to-detect behavior of the child, e.g., activity level, distractibility, adaptability, attention span and persistence, reactions to change in stimulation and intensity of response.

4.5:

5: **Highly responsive.** This parent responds promptly and appropriately to even subtle and hard-to-detect behavior of the child, e.g., activity level, distractibility, adaptability, attention span and persistence, reactions to change in stimulation and intensity of response.

4. Reciprocal Engagement

This item refers to the parent's ability to engage the child in the play interaction. It determines the extent to which parent is able to gain the child's attention, cooperation and participation in a reciprocal exchange characterized by balanced turntaking in play or conversation. **To do this successfully the parent must also display considerable sensitivity and responsivity.**

1: **Parent does not keep the child engaged in the interaction**. The parent makes attempts to elicit the child's cooperation, but the child does not respond. Most of the attempts, when made, are characterized by poor timing, lack of clarity and/or a half-hearted appearance. Parent may give the appearance of helplessness where the child is concerned or may be involved in behaviors completely unrelated to the child and the child's cues, e.g., as in parallel play.

1.5:

2: **Parent has great difficulty in keeping the child engaged in the interaction.** In a few instances only, the parent gains the child's cooperation, but the child usually does not respond. Some of the parent's attempts to elicit the child's cooperation are characterized by poor timing, lack of clarity and/or half-hearted appearance.

2.5:

3: **Parent keeps the child engaged in the interaction but there is little or no reciprocal exchange of turns in play or conversation and parent tends to direct the interaction.**

3.5:

4: **Parent keeps the child engaged throughout most of the interaction and often there is a reciprocal exchange of turns in play or conversation.**

4.5:

5: **Parent and child are engaged mutually throughout the entire interaction.** The interaction is characterized by balanced turntaking in play and conversation.

5. Pace

This item examines the parent's rate of behavior. The parent adjusts their behavioral rate or tempo so that it is similar to their child's rate or tempo. Sync refers to the parent's pace adjusted to the child's for optimum stimulation (helps child stay interested if appropriate but doesn't overstimulate; is in rhythm with the child's rhythm).

• Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

1: **Parent's pace/tempo is entirely out of sync with child's.** Either the parent has a rapid fire pace that does not allow the child time to react or the parent lags behind the child's tempo or is so slow to respond that by the time the parent does respond the child has already gone on to something else.

1.5:

2: **Parent's pace/tempo out of sync with child's most of the time.**

2.5:

3: **Parent's pace/temp out of sync with child's about as much as it is in sync.**

3.5:

4: **Parent's pace/temp is in sync with child's most of the time.**

4.5:

5: **Parent's and child's paces highly synchronized.** Parent waits as long as needed for child to react and follows the child's lead with regard to rate or tempo.

6. Encouragement of Sensorimotor and Cognitive Development

This item is concerned with the parent's developmentally appropriate encouragement of sensorimotor and cognitive development. This item assesses the amount of verbal and non-verbal support by the parent that is overtly oriented toward promoting the child's development and learning. This item assesses the extent to which the parent overtly attempts to foster sensorimotor and cognitive development, whether through play, verbal and non-verbal encouragement, guidance or noticing and acting upon opportunities presented by the environment. It assesses the parent's ability to follow the childs' lead and elaborate on what the child is doing or to offer the child a toy or learning opportunity without pressuring the child to do what the parent wants the child to do.

1: **Encouragement is absent**. Parent makes no verbal or non-verbal attempt or effort to support the child's learning and development and/or exerts much verbal or non-verbal pressure on the child to achieve what interests the parent only or what is developmentally inappropriate.

1.5:

2: **Little encouragement**. Parent makes a few mild verbal or non-verbal attempts at supporting the child's learning and development but the interaction is oriented to play for the sake of playing rather than supporting the child and/or exerts some verbal or non-verbal pressure on the child to achieve what interests the parent only or what is developmentally inappropriate.

2.5:

3: **Moderate encouragement**. Parent makes several verbal or non-verbal attempts at supporting the child's learning and development. Parent does not verbally or non-verbally pressure the child to achieve what interests the parent only or what is developmentally inappropriate.

3.5:

4: **Considerable encouragement.** Parent makes several verbal and non-verbal attempts at supporting the child's learning and development that are developmentally appropriate, following the child's lead and enhancing or elaborating on what the child is doing. Parent avoids pressuring the child.

4.5:

* Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

5: **Very high encouragement.** Parent consistently and developmentally appropriately supports sensorimotor and cognitive development through play, verbal and non-verbal encouragement, guidance or noticing and acting upon opportunities presented by the environment.

7. Inventiveness/Creativity

This item assesses the range of stimulation parents provide their child; the number of different approaches and types of interactions and the ability to find different things to interest the child, different ways of using toys, combining the toys and inventing games with or without toys. Inventiveness/creativity is purposeful in the sense that it is directed toward and successful in either maintaining or enhancing the child's involvement in the situation. Inventiveness/creativity does not refer merely to a number of different, random behaviors, but rather to a variety of behaviors that are grouped together and directed towards the child. **Inventiveness/creativity assumes reciprocal engagement between parent and child.**

1: **No inventiveness/creativity.** Parent is unable to do almost anything with the child; parent seems at a loss for ideas, stumbles around, is unsure of what to do. Parent's actions are simple, stereotyped and repetitive. No reciprocal engagement between parent and child is evident.

1.5:

2: **Small amount of inventiveness/creativity.** Parent does find a few ways to engage the child in the course of the situation, but these are of limited number and tend to be repeated frequently, possibly with long periods of inactivity. Parent uses the toys in some of the standard ways, but does not seem to use other possibilities with toys or free play. Little or no reciprocal engagement between parent and child is evident.

2.5:

3: **Medium amount of inventiveness/creativity.** Parent demonstrates expected uses of toys and materials and common means of interaction. Parent shows some innovativeness in play and use of toys. Some reciprocal engagement between parent and child is evident.

3.5:

4: **Large amount of inventiveness/creativity.** Parent demonstrates expected uses of toys and materials and common means of interaction, but in addition is able to find uses that are especially appropriate to the situation and the child's momentary needs. Reciprocal engagement between parent and child is frequent.

4.5:

5: **Very large amount of inventiveness/creativity.** Parent consistently finds new ways to use toys and/or actions to play with the child. Parent shows both standard uses of toys as well as many unusual but appropriate uses, and is continually able to change his/her behavior in response to the child's needs and state. Reciprocal engagement between parent and child occurs continually throughout the interaction.

8. Guidance/Encouragement of Self-Direction

This item measures the degree to which the parent avoids intervention/interfering with the child's immediate behavior and guides and supports the child's growth in self-direction.

1: **Very interfering/intrusive.** Parent continually attempts to direct the minute details of the child's "free" play. This parent is conspicuous for the extreme frequency of interruption of the child's activity-in-progress so that the parent seems "at" the child most of the time--instructing, training, eliciting, directing, controlling.

• Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

1.5:

2: **Interfering/intrusive.** Parent often indicates what to do next or how to do it. Parent produces a steady stream of suggestive remarks and may initiate a new activity when there has been no previous sign of inertia, interest in a new activity and/or resistance shown by the child.

2.5:

3: **The parent's tendency to make suggestions and direct the child is about equal to the tendency to allow the child self-direction.** The parent may try to influence the child's choice of activity but allows the child independence in the execution of his/her play or may let the child make his/her own choice but be ready with suggestions for effective implementation.

3.5:

4 **Parent occasionally makes suggestions of principles to follow.** This parent rarely tells the child what to do. He/she may respond with advice and criticism when help is requested but in general refrains from initiating such interaction. On the whole, this parent is cooperative and non-interfering.

4.5:

5: **Parent consistently allows child to initiate or continue activities of his/her own choosing without interfering.** Parent consistently is cooperative and avoids volunteering suggestions unless they are specifically requested and then gives supportive guidance in the form of principles rather than specific actions.

9. Absence of Hostility

This item reflects the parent's absence of expression of overt verbal and/or non-verbal anger, hostility, inappropriate aggression, discounting or rejection of the child.

1: **Very hostile.** Parent shows frequent expressions of rejection and hostility toward the child. Parent is continually disapproving of the child and the child's behavior. Rejection/hostility/disapproval is overtly and clearly communicated.

1.5:

2: **Hostile.** Parent shows some rejection or hostility toward the child. Parent shows some disapproval of the child and the child's behavior.

2.5:

3: **Some hostility.** Parent expresses less overt, more muted expressions of hostility/rejection/disapproval, e.g., pulling away an object with a jerk, putting hands on hips to show exasperation, giving the child a brief cold look, parroting or mimicking the child in a hostile fashion.

3.5:

4: **Little or no hostility.** Parent shows little or no signs of rejection, hostility or disapproval.

4.5:

5: **Absence of hostility.** No signs of hostility, rejection or disapproval are evident.

* Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

For Further Information Contact:

Early Childhood Family Education
Minnesota Department of Children,
Families and Learning
992 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
612/296-6130; FAX: 612/297-5695

If using this scale, please credit the source.

* Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

ID: _____

Site Evaluator: _____

PARENTAL BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE*

1. Enjoyment/ Acceptance/Warmth	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
2. Sensitivity to Child	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
3. Responsivity	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
4. Reciprocal Engagement	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
5. Pace	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
6. Encouragement of Sensorimotor & Cognitive Development	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
7. Inventiveness/ Creativity	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
8. Guidance/ Encouragement of Self-Direction	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
9. Absence of Hostility	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5

For Further Information Contact: Early Childhood Family Education, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning, 99
2 Capitol Square Building, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101, 612/296-6130; FAX: 612/297-5695.

* Most recent modifications made by Betty Cooke, Early Childhood Family Education Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (1995). Adapted from Parent Behavior Rating Scale adaptation by Thomas R., Anderson, L., Getahun, L., & Cooke, B. (1992) Teaching for transfer of learning. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, from Gerald Mahoney's 1990 revision of an earlier High Scope Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

Appendix 6: Analysis Notes--Factor Analysis, Regression Analysis and Reliability of Staff and Independent Ratings

by

Elisabeth A. Palmer[1]
Minnesota Center for Survey Research
University of Minnesota

Factor Analysis for Parent Behavior Rating Scale

In this study, a total score for items 1-8 on the Parent Behavior Rating Scale was used rather than individual item scores. A factor analysis on both fall and spring ratings showed that these items represent a single underlying factor (eigenvalue 6.31, 70% explained variance) and that item 9 (absence of hostility) had the smallest loading (.58 vs. .81 for the next lowest).

Regression Analysis: Predicting Parents' Knowledge and Behavior

In an attempt to explain the variation in parents' scores on knowledge and behavior items, several multiple regression analyses were run using staff and independent ratings. The dependent variable was change in scores from fall to spring. Staff ratings included concept area scores, adjusted for the number of items rated, for 'Knowledge and Awareness of Own Child' and 'Parent Behavior.' Independent ratings consisted of an overall score for parent behavior on items 1-8 of the Parent Behavior Rating Scale.

Predictor variables were chosen on the basis of statistically significant ($p =< .005$) bivariate relationships with the dependent variables and included the following:

- Highest level of education completed
- How long lived at present address
- Income
- Number of different community programs participated in
- Number of critical events (risk factors)

---

[1]Elisabeth Palmer assumed a new position as of March 1, 1996. Elisabeth Palmer is an Educational Specialist with the Center for Applied Research in Educational Improvement (CAREI) at the University of Minnesota.

- Number of people in the household
- Parents age
- Employment status
- Have children under the age of two
- Marital status (dichotomized variables for : never married, married, divorced)
- Total hours of exposure to ECFE program

Stepwise regression evaluates all variables currently in the equation for possible removal at each subsequent step. At each step current variables are examined and removed if their probability is greater than .10 (POUT .01). New variables are added if their probability is .05 or less (PIN .05). This process of selection continues until no more variables meet the criteria for inclusion or removal or until the maximum number of steps has been reached.

Conservative interpretations of R classify .10 as weak, .30 as moderate, and .50 as strong in the predictive power. In the social sciences, however, where the data are more complex in nature .30 is considered adequate. Using the latter criteria, these analyses resulted in no meaningful R .

Reliability of Staff and Independent Ratings

When rating behaviors of participants it is important to assess not only the quality of the items being used but also the consistency among judges. Interrater reliability can be assessed in a number of ways, two of which were used in this study.

Correlations between staff and independent ratings.

Both staff and outside raters assessed parents' behavior using different instruments. To determine the extent to which they concurred in their evaluations, correlations were run on fall, spring, and change scores. Staff ratings included the concept area score, adjusted for the number of items rated, for 'Parent Behavior.' Independent ratings consisted of an overall score for parent behavior on items 1-8 of the Parent Behavior Rating Scale. Correlations between fall (.3253, p=.001), spring (.2700, p=.005) and change scores (.2343, p=.018) were all moderately strong and significant at the .05 level. This suggests that although staff and independent raters used different scales of measurement, they rated parents' behavior in similar ways. That is, parents who were scored higher by staff were also likely to be scored higher by the independent raters.

Reliability of independent ratings

Two outside raters used the Parent Behavior Rating Scale to assess parents' behavior as demonstrated in a videotaped interaction with their child. Most parents were rated by only one rater with each rater assessing half of the parents. However, about one-fourth of parents received ratings from both independent raters either in the fall or spring (only three parents were rated by both raters on both occasions). In these cases, it was necessary to test the reliability of scores by partitioning out the sources of variance, that is, the variance attributable to parents, items, and raters. If the amount of score variation due to raters was relatively low compared to other sources and the overall reliability was high, then it would be reasonable to use the independent rater's ratings interchangeably.

To test for these conditions, we used the framework provided by generalizability (G) theory. G-theory is a statistically-informed theory for assessing the reliability of behavioral measures. In contrast to classical test theory, it allows for the estimation of multiple sources of variation at the same time. It also provides an overall index of reliability known as the G-coefficient which allows us to determine what the reliabilities would be using only one or both raters. The statistical procedure employed for this analysis was repeated measures multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA). This analysis provided the variance components noted in Table X for the main effects (parents, items, raters) and their interactions. Variance estimates and reliability coefficients were calculated using fall scores only; the small number of cases with multiple ratings in the spring (N=28) resulted in sampling error which introduced bias into estimates. Given that the same raters were used in both instances, the decision to use only fall ratings is acceptable.

Table X: MANOVA Estimates of Variance Components for Fall Parent Behavior Rating Scale

Rating Scale Source of Variance	df	Mean Squares	Estimated Means Squares	Percentage of Total Variance
Parents (p)	30	24.22	1.180	26.9
Items (i)	8	125.07	1.972	44.9
Raters (j)	1	4.85	0.007	0.2
pi	240	1.62	0.580	13.2
pj	30	1.82	0.151	3.4
ij	8	1.64	0.038	0.9
pij	240	0.46	0.460	10.5
G-coefficient (2 raters)	.997			
G-coefficient (1 rater)	.854			

The greatest source of variation for fall scores came from the items or behaviors being assessed, 44.9% of total variance. This is not surprising given that the behaviors being assessed covered a wide range of skill levels. In other words, some of the assessed behaviors represented more advanced parenting skills and/or more extensive knowledge of early childhood development while others assessed more basic skills and knowledge. The large amount of variance attributed to parents (26.9%) illustrates the different levels of skills and knowledge that parents possessed. Raters themselves accounted for less than 1% of the variance in fall scores indicating a consistency of ratings.

Two indexes of reliability (G-coefficients) were calculated, one assuming two raters and the other only one. In both calculations, items were treated as a fixed facet since parents were always rated on nine items. Since we are interested in the standing or ranking of parents' scores relative to one another and the error attributable to raters, the error term for the G-coefficient included only the interactions of raters with parents. For formulas used, see pp. 41, 93 (modified to include pj interaction), and 96 in Shavelson and Webb.[2] The resulting G-coefficient for two raters was .921 and for only one rater .854. The magnitude of these coefficients can be interpreted on the same scale as classical reliability coefficients as highly reliable. Based on the high score reliability when using only one rater and the negligible variance of raters relative to other sources, a decision was made to randomly select one rater's scores for each parent with multiple ratings.

---

[2]Shavelson, Richard J. and Noreen M. Webb, Generalizability Theory: A Primer, London: Sage (1991).

Appendix 7: Characteristics of Study Families That Dropped Out of the Evaluation

	Study Families F⇒S Drop-Outs n=31
Gender	
Male	---
Female	31(100)
Marital Status	
Married	8(25.0)
Never married	20(62.5)
Divorced/separated	4(12.5)
Widowed	
Education	
8th grade or less	---
Some high school	10(32.3)
High school/GED	5(16.1)
Some college	15(48.4)
Bachelors Degree	1(3.2)
Graduate or Professional School	---
Employment Status	
Unemployed/not seeking	17(53.1)
Unemployed/seeking	5(15.6)
Employed less than 25 hours/week	4(12.5)
Employed 25+ hours/week	6(18.8)
Age	
Less than 20 years	6(18.8)
20-29 years	20(62.5)
30-39 years	6(18.8)
40+ years	---
Children's Ages	
Birth to 5 months	7(21.9)
6-12 months	4(12.5)
13-23 months	14(43.8)
2 years	11(34.4)
3 years	5(15.6)
4 years	4(12.4)
5 years	3(9.4)
6-12 years	3(9.4)
13 years and up	1(3.1)

Appendix 7, *continued*

	F⇒S Drop-Outs n=31
Number in Household	
1	---
2	7(22.6)
3	13(41.9)
4	4(12.9)
5	2(6.5)
6	2(6.5)
7	3(9.7)
8	---
Income	
$0 - $9,999	16(50.0)
$10,000 - $19,999	11(34.4)
$20,000 - $29,999	5(15.6)
Ethnicity	
White (non-Hispanic)	18(62.1)
African American	2(6.9)
Hispanic	2(6.9)
Asian Pacific Islander	3(10.3)
American Indian	4(13.8)
Residency-Neighborhood	
Less than 1 year	12(37.5)
1-3 years	11(34.4)
4-5 years	6(18.8)
5+ years	3(9.4)
Residency-current address	
Less than 1 year	21(65.6)
1-3 years	9(28.1)
4-5 years	1(3.1)
5+ years	1(3.1)
Concerns	
Caring for or raising your children.	14(50.0)
Your own health and well-being.	9(32.1)
Making ends meet.	19(67.9)
Feeling lonely.	13(46.4)
Making contact with schools or teachers.	3(10.7)
Understanding how your job as a parent changes as your child grows.	9(32.1)
Providing food and clothing for your children.	10(35.7)

Appendix 7, *continued*

	Drop-Outs n=31
Number of Different Concerns	
0	4(12.5)
1	6(18.8)
2	6(18.8)
3	10(31.3)
4	3(9.4)
5	2(6.3)
6	---
7	1(3.1)
Critical Events	
Income decreased substantially.	7(22.6)
Death of immediate family member.	2(6.3)
Chronic illness or disability.	1(3.1)
Moved to a new location.	19(59.4)
Home destroyed.	1(3.1)
Alcohol or drug problem.	3(9.4)
Serious money problems.	12(38.7)
Divorce.	2(6.3)
Separation from spouse or partner.	7(21.9)
Entered new school.	13(40.6)
Pregnancy.	7(21.9)
Birth of youngest child.	6(18.8)
Trouble providing children with clothing or shoes.	6(18.8)
Death of parent.	1(3.1)
Trouble W/Teacher.	1(3.1)
Number of Different Events	
0	6(18.8)
1	4(12.5)
2	5(15.6)
3	6(18.8)
4	4(12.5)
5	4(12.5)
6	2(6.3)
7	---
8	1(3.1)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	

Appendix 8: Availability of Evaluation Materials

Materials produced for this evaluation are listed here. All items, except those with an asterisk, are included in the appendices.

- *Two detailed evaluation guides for site evaluators. Evaluation guides include instructions for data collection and analysis.

- Data collection strategies:

  Primary
  Fall and Spring Enrollment Surveys
  Fall and Spring Parent Interview Guides
  Fall and Spring Stimulated Response Interview Guides

  Secondary
  Participation Records
  *District Program Descriptions
  *Site Evaluator Technical Reports

- Interview Coding and Analysis:

  Fall and Spring Parent Interview Analysis Summaries
  Fall and Spring Stimulated Response Interview Analysis Summaries
  Parent Interview--Critical Codes
  Stimulated Response Interview--Critical Codes
  Fall and Spring Interview Score Sheets
  Parent Behavior Rating Scale Score Sheets

Availability

Materials may be copied and used if full reference to authors and Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning is provided on documents and in reports.

For items not included in the appendices, please contact Betty Cooke, Early Childhood and Family Initiatives Specialist, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. Telephone (612) 296-6130 or FAX (612) 297-5695).

References

Cooke, Betty (1992). *Changing Times, Changing Families: Minnesota Early Childhood Family Education Parent Outcome Interview Study.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

Gamby, Deanna S., et al (1995). "Long-Term Outcomes of Early Childhood Programs" in *The Future of Children.* Vol 5, No. 3.

Garbarino, James (1995). *Raising children in a Socially Toxic Environment.* California: Jossey-Bass.

Harvard Family Research Project (1990). *Innovative Models to Guide Family Support and Education Policy in the 1990s: An Analysis of Four Pioneering State Programs.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Jacobs, Francine H. (1988). "The Five-Tiered Approach to Evaluation: Context and Implementation" in Heather B. Weiss and Francine H. Jacobs, Editors, *Evaluating Family Programs.* Hawthorne, New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Kamerman, Sheila B. and Alfred J. Kahn (1995). *Starting Right--How America Neglects Its Youngest Children and What We Can Do About It.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, Pamela B. (1993). *Building Villages To Raise Our Children: Evaluation.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Family Research Project.

Minnesota Department of Education (1986). *Evaluation Study of Early Childhood Family Education--Report to the Legislature March 1, 1986.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

St. Pierre, Robert G. et al (1995). "Two-Generation Programs: Design, Cost, and Short-Term Effectiveness" in *The Future of Children,* Vol 5, No. 3.

Seppanen, Patricia S. and Jeanne Hirfetz (1988). *Community Education as a Home for Family Support and Education Programs.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

"States Make Investments Toward the Well-Being of Children and Families" (1995) *National Center for Children in Poverty, News and Issues.* Volume 5, No. 3.

Weiss, Heather and Robert Halpern (1990). *Community-Based Family Support and Education Programs: Something Old or Something New?* New York: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University.

Yoshikawa, Hirokazu (1995). "Long-Term Effects of Early Childhood Programs on Social Outcomes and Delinquency" in *The Future of Children.* Vol 5, No. 3.

Marsha R. Mueller

Evaluation Consultant
2703 Brookridge Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55422
(612) 591-1315

Marsha Mueller directs an evaluation practice which focuses on a range of human service and education programs. Commissions include research, consultation, and training on a variety of issues and programs: family support; early childhood family education; family service collaboratives; loan programs for low income families; adolescent pregnancy prevention; organization and leadership development; learning readiness; parent involvement; higher education; and alternative high school programs. Recent clients include state governments, national and regional foundations, nonprofit organizations and universities.

Marsha earned a masters degree from the Department of Social Sciences, University of Chicago, an undergraduate degree in Family Environment from Iowa State University and has completed additional graduate work at the University of Minnesota. In addition to directing a consulting practice, Mueller was an academic staff member of the University of Minnesota for several years serving as program development specialist and associate professor and program evaluator for the Minnesota Extension Service. Mueller was also a staff member and program manager for the University of Illinois and The Pennsylvania State University.

Minnesota Children

Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning

550 Cedar Street • St. Paul, Minnesota • 55101-2273

Phone (612) 296-6104 • FAX (612) 296-1272 • TTY (612) 297-2094

Information (612) 296-6104

E-mail: Children@state.mn.us

Internet: http://children.state.mn.us